Boston University

Graduate School

Dissertation

Foreigners Represented as National Types in the English Comedy of the Restoration and the Eighteenth Century

by

Henry Ernest Smith

(A.B. University of Chicago, 1902; M.A., Yale, 1911)

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

1932

Foreigners Represented as National Types in the English Comedy of the Restoration and the Eighteenth Century.

Introduction.

Types, whether social or literary, are the product of an age of convention. They are the result of customs grown artificial, of strict conformity to a model. When a number of individuals begin to act, speak, and dress in the same way, or when society begins to attribute to a group of individuals traits and characteristics common to all, types result. Conformity to type is the antithesis of individualism; it marks an age in which habits and customs have become crystalized; it represents a society that is imitative. Conventionality, artificiality, imitation, conformity - these are all necessary to the formation of type. Such an age was the eighteenth century in England.

Certain conventions in literature, like the Italian commedia dell'arte, the Spanish picaresque drama, the French bourgeois comedy, the English sentimental comedy, or the heroic drama, give rise to conventional types of character. The Italian produced harlequin and pantaloon; the Spanish gave the picaroon and gracioso; the age of Louis XIV, in France begot the fopling and the bourgeois gentilhomme; the English heroic play presented the "hero" and the "heroine," the lovelorn man and lovelorn woman.

These types are in reality handed down from one age and country to another. The "miles gloriosus," for instance, descended from Plautus to the Italian in Dolce's Capitano, or passed into the French and Spanish drama through Francesco

Andreini as "Capitano Spavento." In France he is Faillebras in Baif's Le Brave, or in Remy Belleau's Capitaine Rodomont. In England he is present in the "Herod" of the early morality plays; in Ralph Roister Doister; in Falstaff of Henry IV; in Bobadil of Every Man in His Humour. In the Restoration drama the "Hero," on the one hand, and the "Wicked Man," on the other, present the two sides of the "miles gloriosus." Finally, the type appears again in the swaggering Irish soldier of the eighteenth century.

For the earliest type characters represented in comedy we must go to Menander Aristophanes. Athenian comedy writers held us up to ridicule the social and literary peculiarities of their time. On the Greek stage was the "cheeky slave", who loved to crack jokes and play pranks. He was in some respects like "Merygreeke," in others like a "Dromio." In The Birds he was represented as a cunning sharper - "an impudent, rascally, but indispensible type."[1] Another common type was the "heavy father" who, though he assumed the right to admonish and reprimand, was duped by the clever slave, or was made to fall into the very follies against which he had warned his inferiors. The courtesan, the parasite, the cook, and the smooth-tongued lawyers were other types that constantly appeared in Athenian comedy. Social conditions then, as afterwards, were conducive to such types. The "self-conceited cook" took occasion to parade his culinary ability; the "parisite" constantly invited himself to your host's or your own dinner, much to your annoyance, or was sure to appear unannounced

1. "The theatre of the Greeks" - 1887, John W. Donaldson, p.89. Ed. 1875.

on your threshold with his idle jests and witless antics. The lawyer was frequently parodied on the Greek stage. Says Professor Moulton: "The proceedings of the law-courts are continually before us, and we are familiar with the ways of the smooth-tongued advocates and the insolence of the lawyer-youths."[1] The boastful soldier was a natural product of Greek wars, and a common type in Greek comedy. Asia and Egypt offered service and good pay to any number of Greeks who would become mercenaries. Here was a chance for adventure and promotion for many restless Athenians and citizens of other Greek towns; and when they returned with full purse, swaggering tongue, and strutting gait, they became ready material for travesty or satire. Comedy is in no age or country free from such type characters, since society usually reacts in some way to abolish the fruits of its own follies.

It was natural enough that Latin comedy should pick up the stock characters of the Greek, just as the Latins imitated Greek literature in other respects. We find, then, among the common stock or type characters of Plautus and Terence a repetition of what we found in Athenian comedy. In the Prologue to Eunuchus Terence says: "The Colax is a Play of Menander's; in it there is a Colax (flatterer), a parasite, and a braggart captain--- If it is not permitted us to use the same characters as others, how can it any more be allowed to represent hurrying servants, to describe virtuous matrons, artful courtesans, the gluttonous parasite, the braggart captain, the infant palmed off, the old man cajoled by the servant about love, hatred, suspicion?"[2] Not only was it con-

1. "Ancient Classic Drama"- R.G. Moulton. p.325, Ed. 1898.
2. Prologue to "Eunuchus." Terence.

venient for Plautus and Terence to copy what was ready at hand, and what would serve their purpose to amuse Roman audiences, but these stock characters must have been as common in the society of Rome as they had been several hundred years before in Athens. Cicero's treatment of the "silly old man" in De Senectute shows how one of the stock characters of Latin play-wrights was common to the society of the time. He called the "old man"[1] a favorite character in Roman comedy, "having a part in almost every comic drama extant." In Poenulus Plautus presents the boastful soldier, who slays sixty thousand fleeing enemies with his own hands. Plautus also employs the fake doctor and the miser, who appeared first in Menander, and later in Molière and Shadwell.

Italian comedy is likewise built up, to a considerable extent, by type characters. Colmo's Rabbioso and Dolce's Capitano, of the early sixteenth century, are the boastful captain brought down to more recent times. The Bugbears is a sixteenth century representation in Italian comedy of Latin types- the foolish father, the saucy servant, the fake doctor and others.

Latin influences are, in their turn, manifest in Spanish and French comedy. In the Spanish "Matamore" we have the boastful captain; and in the "eternallyduped pantaloons," the foolish old man of the classic drama. In Molière are represented several distinct Latin types. Molière portrays the foolish old man in Arnople or in Argon, and the saucy servant in Martine or Toinette. Other Classical types he represents are the gossip, the pedant, and the fake doctor. Otto Fest says that Plautus and Terence "first of all and ever gave the tone to and inspired the French

1. "De Senectute"- Cicero, Sec.IX.

comedy writers."[1] He adds that the Italian comedy also exerted influences on the French. Whether the ancient types came into the French through the Italian commedia dell'arte, or came directly, it matters little in the present discussion; what we are interested in is that the same types appear in both French and Italian comedy, that they are highly conventional, and that they are present in periods when literature in general was conventional.

It was natural for the vogue to reach England. Types are especially plentiful in certain writers of Elizabethan comedy. Merygreeke in Ralph Roister Doister partakes of the nature of Artotrogos, the Plautine parasite. Parolles in Alls Well That Ends Well is likewise a later version of Plautine "miles." Zantippa in Peele's Old Wive's Tale is a type of the shrew so common in ancient comedy. In Ben Jonson, however, we find the widest representation of types; for types are characteristic of comedy of manners. The famous Bobadil of Every Man in His Humour pairs well with Parolles; Mrs. Otter in Epicoene is a second Zantippa; and Corbaccio in Volpone is very like the foolish "Old Man" of classical drama. Moreover, Jonson anticipates type characters as represented in the eighteenth century English comedy. Morose in Epicoene is father to Surly of Sir Courtly Nice, or to Manly of The Plain Dealer, or to Sullen of The Beaux Stratagem; La Foole appears again in Cimberton of Steel's The Conscious Lovers, or in Mac Sycophant of Macklin's The Man of the World. Indeed, this Sir Amourous La Foole, a "lavish beau to the ladies," is a good antecedent to Sir Fopling Flutter, perhaps the most famous type character in the Restoration Drama.

1. Dissertation - "Auf Der Miles Gloriosus im Drama des Klassischen Altertums und des Franzosischen Mittlelaters," p.41, 1897. Otto Fest.

In the study of foreign type characters as represented in the Restoration and Eighteenth Century English Comedy, certain problems appear for solution: how England was peculiarly adapted to the development of type characters in English comedy; how international relations contributed to the formation of such characters; why types of one nationality or of one singularity predominated during the Restoration, continued into the Eighteenth century, passed, and gave place to some other type; and why certain types disappear near the middle of the century, only to recur in the latter half or near the end.

International relations - now with Franch, then with Holland; at one time with Ireland, at another with Scotland or Germany or Italy or America- would focus the attention of the English public, and of English writers, upon the people of those countries, respectively; and if the international relations were strained as in time of war, or were all-absorbing for religious reasons or because of economic stress, or were affected even by the unusual ebb and flow of humanity between England and her neighbors, a consciousness of race personality or national idiosyncrasy mighttake concrete form in certain national types. The imagination of artists is always most active in the presence of the unsual or the heterogeneous or the discordant. Images are efforts of the mind to evaluate peoples, and the actions of peoples, about us; these imagines, often recurring, persistent in form, are soon conventionalized and so become types. Thus it is that the stress and strife

of the eighteenth century, the constant clash of nations, the intermingling of nationalities, the contrasts of personalities, the differences of habits and customs, at a time when the individual in England was asserting himself as he had not done before, were best suited to the formation of types, both native and foreign. London was the stage of this variegated world: and the native of London was the observer. Observation, imitation and conformity were peculiarly characteristic of the late seventeenth and the early eighteenth centuries. This is shown by the rise and growth of science after Spinoza, who died in 1677. The scientific point of view was a natural reaction to social conditions, and a harbinger to the neo-classical age that was soon to follow. This scientific trend, then, which got its start in the latter half of the seventeenth century, was doubtless a product of the same habit of mind as started the social trend of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. We may say accordingly that type is the result of a habit of classification, of organization, of discrimination, of a consciousness of social interdependence; and these qualities characterize England in the eighteenth century. For a hundred years after the Restoration, life in England went through a series of rapid changes. These changes were partly political, partly economic, partly social, partly religious; but they were reflected in the manners of the people, and accordingly, in the art and literature of the time. To its early years we give the name classical; but classical means conformity and convention. The classical age of Greece and Rome produced type characters

in literature, as does the classical age of England. Both are ages of realism; both strive to give to the product of their imagination a concrete form. In art this means sculpture or portrait painting; in society it means caricature; in literature it means the "character" essay, the novel of manners, the drama of strongly conventionalized tragic heroes and heroines, or of as strongly conventionalized comic characters. These characters in comedy, when conventionalized and accentuated, form the "types" of the eighteenth century English comedy, which is our subject of discussion.

Political conditions in England during the eighteenth century, and in the relations of England with other countries, were peculiarly adapted to type formations. Within the space of fifty years, extending from the reign of Charles II,to that of George I, England was ruled by four monarchs of foreign birth - for we may well speak of Charles II as foreign, since he began his sojourn in France as a mere child, and was French in all his tastes and leanings. In fact, from 1660 to the nineteenth century only Queen Anne was wholly English, for James II may be called Scotch; William and Mary, Dutch; the Georges, German. Under these rulers the attention of the English public was attracted to the particular country and peoples from which the King came. The relations of England with her King's countries, respectively, would be close and varied; officials and hangers-on in his court would be favorites from his native land; travelers from that land would increase in London. In short, these foreigners in London, now French, now Scotch, now Dutch and finally German, afforded the London populace

a ready source of amusement and the London play-wright fit characters for his stage. The niches these peoples filled in London, their occupations in the city, their odd customs and manners, were readily adaptable to type presentation.

The presence of these foreign monarchs must have been a constant source of irritation to the English people. The more patriotic chafed under foreign rule; certain Englishmen who were displaced, either in political, church, or industrial positions, by foreigners were incensed; the intrusion likewise of exotic manners in action, speech, and dress made the Londoner uneasy. To retaliate, the natives resorted to lampoons and caricatures, of the intruders, to ridicule, or even to violent physical encounters in public places and on the streets. Although Charles II, in 1660, was received in London with much enthusiasm, we must attribute the attitude of the people in this case to the fact that they were ready for any change of government, and that they very probably did not realize how un-English the King had become. We cannot disguise the fact that the English people had long hated the French, a feeling which was moreover, mutual. Bastide, speaking of the century before, says: "The History of relations of France and England in the past is a record of painful endeavors of the two nations to come to an understanding."[1] Early in the seventeenth century HenryIV of France observed that "The English have an extraordinary hatred for us;"[2] and the French envoy, Courtin, declared "they hate us," though French literature and French fashions were "in highest favour in England."

1. L'Influence Français en Angleterre eu XVIIe. Siècle. Introduction, p.VII.
2. Letter to M. de Beaumont. 1640.

It was not, however, only the French whom the English people hated, and whose dislike led to caricature as types in English comedy; the English entertained a hostile disposition toward practically every other foreign people. Quarrels with these nations which led to wars; religious disputes and persecutions; commercial and industrial rivalries which threatened English supremacy - these and other causes operated to keep up strained relations.

In the reign of Charles II there was no military clash with France, for, we may be sure, Charles would do nothing to exasperate the land of his adoption. There were, however, internal forces which absorbed public interest, and formulated a public opinion of France and things.French. The royalists' bitter disappointment because the "Declaration of Breda" did not return to them their confiscated lands; the protestant sects' anger because the King favored general toleration to catholic and protestant alike; Charles's secretly joining the catholic church; the fear of catholicism which led to the "Test Act;" the "Popish Plot;" the rumors of a French invasion to establish catholicism in England; the quarrel of Charles with his ministers over his profligacy and his misuse of the taxes; the rise and activities of the Whig and the Tory parties - these and other great enactments and movements kept the relations of King and people strained. The people feared Charles. They suspected his motives. They distrusted his French ways, French court, French leanings. They denounced the depravity of England's whole Frenchified court. Even the law courts became corrupt. Lecky tells us that in no age or country had "State trials been conducted with more flagrant disregard for justice and decency,

and with a more scandalous subserviency to the crown,"[1] than during the reign of Charles. But Charles insisted on appointing Frenchmen, as far as he could or dared, to positions under him. The Queen's almoner was Cardinal D'Anbigny; Louis de Duras commanded a regiment of guards; Nicholas Lefèvre became head of the Royal laboratory; Blondeau engraved the English coins; Falvallière was the King's engineer.[2]

Nor were the acts of James II, Charles's successor to the throne, less calculated to estrange the English public from him, and to cherish their hatred for things French. His cruelty in case of the "Bloody Assizes," and his "succession of acts of unpopularity," showed too clearly that he intended to follow in the footsteps of Charles, so far as indifference to the public and friendship for France and catholicism were concerned. Furthermore, the people, themselves never entirely just or discriminating, hated France the more because she became the King's protector when, as a refugee, he carried the infant heir to Paris on the invasion of William of Orange, and entered into a plot with James to restore him to the throne by means of French armies. The war which France now, 1690, made on England in the interest of James, was soon drawn upon by the writers of the time. Shadwell has this dialogue between a Jacobite Alderman, Sir Humphry Maggot, and a city wit, Whachum:

"Maggot - "Look you the King of France will have the greatest Fleet in the world at Needles by February."

Whachum - "But those French do so burn Houses, Churches, Barns, Men,

1. "A History of England in the 18th. Century"- Edward Hartpole Lecky, Vol. I p.9 1892.
2. "Rene Mezandieu" Angliae Notitia, p.154.

Women, and Children that I am afraid they'll do a great deal of hurt." [1]

We learn from Lecky that during the Revolution there was a "hatred of foreigners deeply rooted in the English mind," and that the "hatred of Irish and of French were leading elements in popular feeling against James."[2] This hatred increased until in a few decades a Frenchman might be called "French dog" twenty times as he passed along the London streets, the "most forcible insult that can be given to any man."[3]

We must not suppose that English animosity toward France was due to the faithlessness of Charles and James alone. Strained relations had existed, perhaps, since the loss of Calais, 1558. At any rate, the strained relations kept alive a spirit of resentment, of ridicule, of caricature, which afforded material to the English playwrights. This spirit is shown in plays of the time. Belon ridiculed French cowardice in The Mock Duelist.[4] The wars from 1690 to 1713 afforded many pretexts for such ridicule, or other vent of spleen upon France. In Sir Barnaby Whigg a character cries,"The Turk, the French, the Moors, nay the Devil will have us."[5] Note the association. In a later play Durfey makes Berneice, a woman character, say to Captain Darew, "none of your Culverin shot here, good Captain, you had better use it against the French."[6] Thomas Dilke speaks of the invention of a "fiery Machine that shall invisibly roll under Water for some Leagues,

1."The Scowerers,"III,i,Thomas Shadwell, 1691.
2."A History of England in the Eighteenth Century," Vol.I,p.21, Edward Hartpole Lecky, 1892.
3."Letters of Monsieur César de Saussûre to His Family," Feb.1726.
4. II, i, Peter Belon. 1675.
5. II, i, Thomas Durfey. 1681.
6."The Marriage Hater Matched," III, ii, 1692.

then burst with that tremendous Violence, that shall rend the French Fleet to Atoms."[1] Mrs.Centlivre often draws on the French wars for material. In one of her plays, Belair associates the "Mischief of the Turks in Hungary" with "The French in Flanders;"[2] in another, Sir Richard predicts that his race

> "Shall the Pride of France and Spain pull down,
> And add their Indies to the English Crown;"[3]

in a third, Colonel Feignwell "headed a regiment of the bravest fellows that ever pushed a bayonet in the throat of a Frenchman."[4] Patriotism must have run high during these years of war with Holland, Spain, and France. Foote has Frenchmen "caper higher and run faster than they have done since the battle of Blenheim."[5] Throughout the eighteenth century dramatists loved to parody French fighting. Mrs. Cowley regrets that so many "stout well-built young fellows" should be "masquerading, and cutting courantas here at home," instead of making the French caper "to the tune of their cannon."[6] Burgoyne, whom we know as the English general that commanded the British troops in the American Revolution, has Peggy "hate the French --- as a true English woman."[7] From Doran we learn of a riot that occured in 1753 when Garrick was about to produce <u>The Chinese Festival</u>, because of hatred for the French with whom England was at war.[8] From the <u>Critical Review</u> of the time we learn that The <u>Chinese Festival</u>, which "drew all Paris after it," was a failure in London. The populace

1. "The Lover's Luck," II,i. 1696.
2. "Love at a Venture," I,i.1706.
3. "The Basset Table,"IV,i. 1706.
4. "Bold Stroke for a Wife," V,i. 1718.
5. "The Englishman Return'd from Paris," II,i. 1756.
6. "The Belle's Stratagem," IV,i. 1781.
7. "Lord of the Manor," III,i. 1780.
8. "Annals of the English Stage," II, p.186.

"could not help owning its beauties," and the fashionable people supported the entertainment; but the head-strong mob became quite furious, and converted the habitation of laughter and play into a dreadful field of battle, because "among a great number of dancers, there happened to be a few French." The writer adds that the ballet was never again exhibited.[1] Let it be noted that in 1756 the "Seven Years' War" with France was begun, and that in 1777 France was again drawn into conflict with England over America. Strained international relations are rich fields for dramatic exploitation, and for the portrayal of foreign characters in drama.

Political conditions within England before and during the eighteenth century were also fit fields for type-character formation, and play-wrights made use of these conditions. The situation early in the reign of George I gave rise to two political parties, the Whig, and the Tory. The very names of these parties are, in either case, due to national prejudices. The word "Whig" is derived from "whey" which poverty obliged the Scotch to drink, and was used first in contempt of the Scotch Presbyterians in England; that of "Tory," from the name of an Irish robber, and was first used by Oates at the time of the "Popish Plot," and then was applied to the Irish Catholic friends of the Duke of York at the time of the "Exclusion Bill."[2] The antipathy between the two political parties was, from the first, very bitter, and each tried "to render its opponent odious to the public by personal abuse." As tools in the hands of these factions, there appeared at this time two very effective political forces, which also became literary forces, and eventually show a close relation to the treatment of type characters in the

1. Vol. I p.184.
2. "England in the Eighteenth Century"- W.E.H. Lecky. Vol. I p.21.

drama of the time. These were caricature and "the press." According to Thomas Wright, caricature had its birth in Holland, prior to 1688.[1] At any rate, it rose to its highest point of influence and power in England in the early reign of George I, and had for its supreme artist, William Hogarth. The other tool in the hands of the parties was "the press," which wielded great influence, especially for evil. By means of a scurrilous press, and by means of highly grotesque and suggestive cartoons, the two parties carried on their campaigns of abuse, and the public sat back to enjoy the spectacle, which was itself in many ways very like low comedy. A multitude of low libels and seditious papers were sold on the streets for a half-penny. One of these, showing "A Dialogue between my Lord B----ke and my Lord W----n"(Bolingbroke and Wharton), is preserved in the British Museum. Soon the parties resorted to raising mobs composed of High-Churchmen against the Presbyterians and other sects, and the church was drawn into the travesty. Finally the stage itself was solicited by one or another faction to spread its propaganda. Prologues, or the plays themselves, contained sentiments of allusions that drove the masses to riot. Farces were actually acted, championing one or the other party. Sometimes caricatures were drawn on the Frontispiece of plays to be exhibited in shops or represented in action on the stage. Soon pulpit and stage locked horns, and various churchmen might find themselves characterized in one or another journal. The graphic representation of the time in caricature as developed by Hogarth, eventually made character presentation on the stage the bolder and more vigorous. Leading statesmen became the butt of opponents in satire, lampoon,

1. "Caricature History of the Georges"- Preface. 1876.

caricature, and dramatic delineation. Stage was completely drawn into the political turmoil. Writers took sides and sought patronage through this means, using their art as favor or threat. On the other hand, says Beljame, "the protection accorded them is based on politics."[1] Walpole, Pultney, and others were in turn parodied before the theatre spectators. The stage, the press, and the pen were determined to fight Walpole and the government, and his corrupt acts gave them cause. "They opposed any measure of his, no matter how good or bad," says J. Churton Collins.[2] The gross immorality of English politicians like Walpole, at this time was a constant cause for jest. Soon the desire of moneyed classes to enter politics afforded another element in the confused comedy. If we add to these the throngs of Scotchmen, Welshmen, Irishmen, Frenchmen, Germans and Dutchmen that entered London as prisoners, refugees, allies, artisans etc., to be reviewed by the play-wright and populace, we can appreciate how rich was the field for caricature, and hence for character portrayal and type representation on the stage.

We next come to the consideration of economic conditions. Economic conditions, both such as prevailed in England to attract foreign immigrants, and such as obtained after the foreigners entered England, afforded dramatists a field of endeavor. The English generally had been a simple people, whose religious belief opposed any tendency to display in dress or home decoration, and whose tenacious habits were satisfied with roast beef and strong ale in the way of food. The coming of Charles and his court, therefore made this rude simplicity stand out in sharp contrast with the elegance and ostentation of the French. Charles's retinue, moreover, included men of

1. "La Publique et Les Hommes de Lettres," en Angleterre au 18 Siecle. Chap. IV p.339.
2. Voltaire, Montesquieu, andRousseau in England, 1908, p.146.

various professions who mingled with the London populace, seeking opportunities for positions in the crafts or in business, French tailors were now sought to set the fashions and to make the clothes of men in upper classes; and English writers now began to inveigh against French fashions, instead of English "fine Kersey hosen and mean slop." The English, we are told, "do not trouble themselves about dress, but leave that to their womenfolk."[1] Even as late as 1757 the English felt that French fashions were corrupting "the manners and principles of Englishmen." A print by one Boitard ridiculed the rage for French fashions by depicting "Four tackle-porters staggering under a weighty chest of British Night Clothes." It was called "The Imports of Great Britain from France." The economic effect of these changes must have been greater than we can now see.

French cooks, dancing-masters, tutors, and others now sought positions, and were in demand. After Saint Bartholomew's Day a considerable number of French refugees had fled to England, but they had been simple artisans whose work was in demand, and who were soon assimilated. After 1660, however, there was a constantly increasing immigration of Frenchmen of every degree, and the economic effect was marked. Lecky relates how the value of houses in London doubled; coal quadrupled; the value of customs tripled; letter postage multiplied twenty fold. The value of land rose more than three hundred per cent.[2] Wright says that "swarms of milliners, tailors, mantua-makers, frisers, tutoresses for boarding schools, disguised Jesuits, quacks, valet-dechambres, etc."[3] entered London from France.

1. "Letters of Monsieur César de Saussure to his family" Feb. 1726.
2. "A History of England in the 18th Century" Vol. I p.210.
3. "England Under the House of Hanover"- Thomas Wright, Vol. II, p. 252.

In addition to the French men and women who invaded England, were the huge quantities of French goods that followed immigration, most of which were used by the Frenchmen in London themselves, or were disposed of to English men and women who were already aping the new fashions. Chests of beauty-washes, pomatum, l'eau d'Hongrie, L'eau de crème, French wines, French fabrics, gloves, shoes, trinkets, jewelry - anything was displayed that would dazzle the eyes of would-be purchasers. To such vast quantities did these French goods increase before the eighteenth century had far progressed, that many of them were prohibited. Then smuggling was resorted to. The Admiralty Court was constantly engaged in trying cases in which French wares were brought into England in the guise of Spanish, Dutch, or Swedish merchandise. The dramatist Farquhar has a character report how his "ship the Swan is newly arrived from St. Sebastion, laden with Portugal wines," and that "a tidewater has the face to affirm, 'tis French wines in Spanish casks, and has indicted me upon the statute."[1] According to Charlanne "numerous Bordeaux merchants frequented London" because "the Bordeaux wine merchants, the Rouen printers, the Paris glove-makers, could not always trust their English agents when some difficult question arose."[2]

Economic revolution, however, continued with the constant increase of French refugees. At the "Revocation to the Edict of Nantes" between 50,000 and 100,000 French Protestants entered England. By 1750 the influx had become so great, that Spital Fields was almost wholly occupied by French silk manufacturers. "The making of silk,

1. "The Constant Couple" I i.
2. "L'Influence Français en Angleterre au XVII e Siècle."

cambric, glass, pottery, paper, woolens, tanning, damasks, velvet, baize, clocks, musical instruments, felt hats, toys,etc., owe their origin to French refugees in different parts of England," says Lecky.[1] Foreign immigrants also improved the soil, started scientific gardening, and introduced unknown plants.

That the economic conditions ensuing from this incursion of French people would displease the native English, goes without saying. The English resented the presence of so many foreigners, especially if they had lost positions because of the French. De Saussure writes: "it is almost dangerous for an honest man, and more particularly for a foreigner, if at all well dressed, to walk the streets," and adds that he probably would be "bespattered with mud, and have dead dogs and cats thrown at him."[2] Mantesquin found the English attitude very unpleasant. "Even the University men showed bad manners, and the women were unresponsive and repellent." The English were, however, not always the aggressors, for the French weavers, for example, often caused riots at seeing servants and country people in Indian chintzes and Dutch printed calicoes instead of in French fabrics. Hence laws were enacted in 1719, to prevent the displacing of English weavers. Furthermore, the English people were stirred up at the great invasion of French workmen and servants, fearing that these foreigners might, in case of war, form a strong French army in their very midst. Patriotism thus came to the support of the populace. A "Weekly Essay" complains how "French servants --- have

1."History of England in the 18th Century"- Lecky. Vol.I, p. 208.
2. "Letters to his family," Feb. 1726.

the Honour to be preferred to the chief Places, while those of our own nation must act the inferior Parts or none at all." The article continues, "I am confident that English servants can equal them in all Things, except fawning and impudence."[1]

The natural method of retaliation for Englishmen in these cases was ridicule, satire, and caricature. There is preserved a print of a "cask of French cheese being raffiniè," and a boy is represented as stopping his nostrils, beinggreatly offended at the hout-goût."[2] Another caricature is of "several emaciated high Liv'd epicures familiarly receiving a French cook, and acquainting him that, without his assistance, they must have perished with hunger." Besides these lampoons, some humorous (but at that time perhaps thought quite serious) articles were written.[3] A book called Verral's Complete System of Cookery contrasted the English and French culinary art. It writes as follows:

> "Good animal food is always productive of good rich chyle; rich chyle well concocted, will afford good spirits; and good spirits are a main ingredient in courage and intrepidity. You have, doubtless, heard the song called The Roast Beef of Old England: you likewise know, that in good Queen Bess's days, the ladies of honour breakfasted upon cold beef and strong ale, and were such viragos, that they snapped their fingers in derision at the Spanish Armada."

Similiar articles appeared to ridicule French fashions, French manners, and French men and women generally. Religion was another element in the intricate condition of eighteenth century London. The eighteenth century was a period of religious turmoil. It was a period of contest first by Protestant denominations to keep in check catholicism as

1. "The Gentleman's Magazine," Mar. 1744.
2. "England under the House of Hanover," - Thomas Wright, Vol. I, p. 352.
3. "The Critical Review", p. 288, 1764.

augmented by French increments after the Restoration; and, secondly, by the English government under William to crush catholicism in Ireland. It however expanded by 1690 into a contest between Episcopacy and Presbyterianism in Scotland, which drew England into the conflict. In every case the English cause prevailed; but it kept religious hatred rife throughout the century, and fomented intense hatred on the part of the French, Irish, and Scotch people toward England.

The spirit of this estrangement is well shown in the drama of the Restoration and early eighteenth century; and after James II came to the throne, rumors floated about London as to how "Monsieur (the King) will make your souls suffer,"[1] obviously in an effort to convert protestants to the popish religion. Farquhar has a French priest attempt to convert an English servant, who is obstinate. "Sir," protests Scrub, "I wont be saved your way- I hate a priest; I abhor the French; I defy the devil. Sir, I am a bold Britain, and will spill the last drop of my blood to keep out popery and slavery."[2] As French servants and French adventurers in England increased, the native population became apprehensive; it feared lest these aliens become so many secret agents for the catholic governments of France and Spain. To this fear must be added propaganda by refugees from France and Ireland. French ministers like Satur, Soritié, Du L'Augle, and other Frenchmen like Bibo and Justel printed pamphlets in England against the religion and government of France. People talked "fiercely in London coffee-houses" of all that was happening in France, and many thought it was "in consequence of England's having a Catholic King."[3] James, France, and catholicism were the common subjects of

1. "Jacobites' Hopes Frustrated." 1690.
2. "Beaux Stratagem." IV i. 1707.
3. "L'Influence Français en Angleterre" au XVII e Siècle p. 106.

discussion. The most ridiculous and fanciful stories were told, namely, that part of the French nation was shut up in the Bastille, and the rest reduced to beggary. Writers in France according to these reports were "set up in the Pillory." These conditions, it was supposed, would be repeated in England. English people would soon have to "trot about in wooden shoes, à la mode de France" - a fine theme for caricature and comedy! The statement added, that Monsieur would soon "make your souls suffer as well as your bodies," afforded opportunity for punning, a trick to which the English glibly resorted. In time refugees, like the Huguenots, joined with different English sects. Some of them held with Scotch Presbyterians; others joined the Catholics; a few leaned toward Episcopacy. Heated discussions arose. Thus there developed by 1688 three great passions - attachment to the throne, attachment to the church, and the dread of catholicism.

If the protestant churches had shown vitality after the Restoration and during the early eighteenth century, if they had been militant, aggressive, the religious unrest would probably have become violent and destructive, and have given rise to a literature similar to that of the "Civil War" under Cromwell - abusive tractates of violent protest. There were, however, no fixed policy, no dominant purpose, and no outstanding leader on either side. Puritanism was helplessly discredited, and so became an object of ridicule. It became a rich field for exploitation by writers, and the clergy barely escaped being treated as comic types, as was the Irish priest.

Social conditions in England were, however, a still richer and a more direct field for exploitation by play-wrights. The

English people, generally, settled back into a state of indifference in social matters, perfectly willing to be directed and guided by the fashionable but corrupt court. "It is to be hoped," said a writer of the time, "this once wise and sober nation will awaken from its Lethargy."[1] Addison condemns the popularity of vice, of levity, of impiety, of buffoonery; he trusts that laughers may some day "in their turn become ridiculous."

> "There's an old Dame - Pox on her, ----
> An old morose, damn'd grinning Jade, call'd Honour --"[2]

This is the kind of social conscience which aroused Jeremy Collier to his denunciation of the stage; but the stage merely held the mirror up to society. It was a society in which profanity passed for wit, obscenity for polite conversation, a tweak by the nose for keen repartee. Gambling, faro-banks, masquerades, and riotous amusements occupied the time of gentlemen of the court. Before the beginning of the eighteenth century, newspaper "ads" were insolently printed to supply mistresses. Adultery became almost a mania among the fashionable. Divorces had taken an appalling increase. A woman showing a willingness to enter into polite conversation with a gentleman newly met, was in danger of receiving soon after from the man a billet-doux, in which he boldly asked her to form a liaison with him. The gallant might still approach a lady with "votre valet bien humble!" as he bowed low; and she would respond with "votre esclave, Monsieur, de tout mon coeur!"[3] for the mania to ape the French had not been lost. Yet men, and even women, sank to unbelievable brutality in court, at plays, and even in church.

1. "Creation." Blackmore, Preface.
2. "A Plot and no Plot." Dennis, 1697.
3. "Sir Courtly Nice." Crowne. II i. 1685.

The people worshipped baubles. Aristocratic precedents, standards, customs were held up to the admiring eyes of an eager, imitative populace. Yet every social standard was unreal and fictitious - a mere conformity. The oldest son of rank was to uphold the dignity and perpetuate the vanity of the family. He was heir. To him fell the property. Younger sons, however, must also live up to family standards; hence let country be burdened and "professions degraded" to furnish posts, mere sinecures, for these younger scions. Aristocratic institutions must be preserved, however fictitious the standards. If a young Lord could increase his income in no other way, he took to gambling. Charles James Fox at fourteen was taught by his father, Lord Holland, how to gamble, and lost no less than £140,000, which his father had to pay; yet Fox later held an important position in the government. Furthermore, young boys were left to the corrupting influences of their tutors, who introduced their tender charges to all the frivolity and brutality of Parisian high life. Together tutor and boy spent their time "over toilette, or at the boudoir of women of fashion, whose principles were no more delicate than their own, lisping scandal and gallantry."[1] The court thought gallantry essential to its caste; yet the King called his ministers "rogues, scoundrels, impertinent fools, stinking, choleric blockheads."[2] Even Walpole debased himself with such language. Statesmen held that conscience was fit only for children; that good and evil were not essentially different; that honesty was merely synonynmous with simplicity.

The manners and dress of the court were constant objects of study and imitation by all the would-be fashionable. The nobleman

1. "England under the House of Hanover." Thomas Wright. Vol.II p.258. 1848.
2. "Social England." H.D. Traill. p.184. 1894.

paraded himself, his family, his attachment at court, his manners, his power, his dignity. He spent his time on dress, at the gaming table, at the play, at the masquerade; but wherever he might be, his one aim was display. In public places - park, theatre, and even churches - he sat where he could best be seen, struck poses that would best display his form and clothes, and ogled the women. The King often set the pace. Evelyn described Charles as whiling away his time in parading himself in rich but fantastic foreign costumes;

> "His Majesty put himself solemnly into... the Persian mode, with girdles of stripes, and shoe-strings and garters, into buckles, of which some were set with precious stones, resolving never to alter it and to leave the French mode, which had hither to obtained to our great expense and reproach."[1]

Shadwell fittingly describes these fops on display:

> "Sparks who with brisk Dress and Mein,
> Come not to hear or see, but to be seen.
> Each plumes himself, and with a languishing Eye,
> Designs to kill a Lady, by the by."[2]

These gallants were mere bundles of vanity, of pride, of folly, - silly, "huffing things," or "walking mercer's shops" they were facetiously called. Such frivolities were, of course, aped by young gallants of different rank. One of these was George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, whom Dryden described as fiddler, rhymer, beau, wit, politician, chemist, soldier, buffoon; as skilled in riding, fencing,dancing, and repartee.[3]

The beau, of course, existed before the time of Charles II; and he also survived the eighteenth century; in Leicester who knelt before Queen Elizabeth to have her help him on with his robes;

1. "Diary" Oct. 18, 1666.
2. "Epilogue to the Squire of Alsatia." 1688.
3. "Absolom and Achitophel." ll.550 ff.

in the Earl of Surrey who loved elaborate clothes, embroideries, and jewels; in Raleigh, whose clothes were of the costliest fabric and richest color; and in others, the gallant was already a part of courtly display. Thus Villiers, Sir George Hewitt "(Beau Hewitt)", Lord Dorset, De Grammont, Sir Charles Sedley, and others were merely heirs to a line of fops who had preceded them a hundred years. Indeed, some of the very creators of beaux on the stage - Congreve, Etherege, et. al. - were themselves classed among the dandies of their time. In fact, "Beau Hewitt" was the model of "Sir Fopling Flutter," that prince of foppish creations in the late seventeenth century comedy. Etherege also loved gay dress - silks, velvet, ribbons, lace, plumes, gems. He was moreover, an associate of Buckingham, and one of the finest gentlemen about court. The fad did not die early. Throughout the century the dandy appeared from time to time on the streets of London in the person of some gentleman of the time. John Hill, a physician, naturalist and author, about the middle of the eighteenth century took on airs of a fashionable gentleman, displayed himself at theatres, aped the manners of the earlier fops, and sought the favors of ladies of quality. "Beau Nash" who lived to see George III on the throne, was a soldier, lawyer, and superintendent of public works; yet he wrote rules for élite occasions, dressed in elaborate fashion, and was called "Knight of Bath," The name applied to a group of fashionable men over whom he presided. Then we must not forget Lord D'Orsay, the Frenchman, who made a second conquest of London society with his retinue of French servants much as did Charles in 1660; and, indeed, "Beau Brummell, who lived at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

By the middle of the eighteenth century society had so doted on foppish types, that Macaroni, as the fop was then called,- from the habit of eating at his club the new food, macaroni, which was newly imported from Italy - was the word for everything fashionable. There was the "Turf Macaroni," the"Parade Macaroni," the "Macaroni Dancing-Master," the "Scholar Macaroni,"[1] and even the "Grub Street Macaroni." A play written 1773, called The Macaroni, ended with these lines:

> "The world's so Macarony'd grown of late,
> That common mortals now are out of date;
> No single class of men their merit claim,
> Or high, or low, in faith 'twas all the same."[2]

These fops filled the theatre, dallied with the orange women, played cards in the boxes, jested with the actors, and generally annoyed the audience. Play-wrights as well as spectators, were, of course, annoyed by these intruders, some of whom discussed play-wrights, others intrigues; some rapped people on their backs, twirled their hats or canes, and looked demurely as if they were innocent.

Otway advises as to what one may expect at the play any afternoon:

> "Thou shalt...at the theatre exalted in a Box, give Audience to ev'ry trim, amorous twisting Fop of the Corner, that comes thither to make a Noise, hear no Play and to show himself."[3]

We find that men and women of good society had simply abandoned themselves to excess of gallantry, flippancy, and pleasure. It was this condition at the play that "The Spectator" so justly condemned.[4]

To add to their attractiveness the gallants decked themselves

1. "Universal Magazine." June 1772.
2. "The Macaroni"- Epilogue - Robert Hitchock. 1773.
3. "Friendship in Fashion." 1678.
4. No. 65.

with fringes and ruffles of lace, with rich fans, scented gloves, and embellished stockings. Then too, they carried pocket mirrors, silver-jeweled snuff-boxes, gold-headed canes, and jeweled swords. Their complexions were improved with apricot paste, aromatic oils and other cosmetics. About their whole person was a stifling odor of fragrant perfumes. These commodities of frivolity were imported from France. "By the fashions, figure, and colour of the clothes," says The Gentleman's Magazine, "We may form a judgment of the sentiments and qualities of the mind."[1] The English indeed believed that French dress was indicative of the valor and civility of the French people, until they beat the French in war, and so gradually abandoned their slavish imitations. English merchants even assumed French accents, or tried to pass for Frenchmen, in order to sell their wares the better. Often they employed French exaggerations in the advertisement of their wares. They sold "incomparable perfumery drops," the "most delectable, fragrant, and odoriferous perfume in nature;" which were, in addition, prophylactics against disease of the head and brain; which "comfort, revive, and refresh all senses, natural, vital and animal;" and which "cheer the heart, and drive away melancholy." They were, in effect, so exquisite, so "admirably curious and delicate," that nothing could compare with them.[2] This frivolity later called forth a large amount of caricature. The gallant was called a "fribble." But the folly was so deeply rooted that it did not pass until the nineteenth century.

Women shared this ridiculous orgy of fickleness. Society of the time seemed to believe with Lord Chesterfield that women should be treated as they were, for it "can never give them greater opinion

1."The Gentleman's Magazine." Feb. 1731.p.56.
2."Anecdotes of the Manners and Customs of London in the 18th Century"- James Peller Malcalm. 1810.

of their beauty"[1] than they had before. Indeed, women became more extravagant than the men, who had set the pace; nor did they lag behind in wasting time over toilette or in the boudoir, "lisping scandal and gallantry," and playing at "pautin," a game of pasteboard puppets. As their fancy sickened with one novelty, it took up another. Fashions and toilette occupied most of the day; social diversions, the night. Pope's "Belinda"[2] illustates truly enough the extent of the craze; and in Addison's Miss Clarinda, the folly is likewise satirized. It took no less than five hours to complete a woman's toilette. Soon came the hooped petti-coat, then the huge hat, and then the outrageous manner of wearing her hair. The hoop-petticoats grew larger and larger, more and more fantastic. With their oval shape and immense projections on the sides of the body, they were facetiously likened to a donkey with a pair of panniers. Not satisfied with these monstrosities, modistes soon added French pockets, which "were held very indecorous," and then began to cut the skirts shorter and shorter. Finally the neck and shoulders were worn bare, as if they had been robbed of their coverings to provide more goods for the hips. Lampoons appeared about these costumes:

> "Your neck and your shoulders both naked should be
> Was it not for vandyke, blown with chevaux de-frise,
> .....
> Make your petticoats short, that a hoop eight yards wide
> May decently show how your garters are tied,"[3]

Not content with this size and expansion there were added immense projections in front made of linen and gauze, and called buffonts; then at the back, below the waist, an equally ugly, large, and ridiculous bulge was added. As if in defiance of all jokes, lampoons,

1. "Correspondence of Le Comte de Dominges." Vol.II p.240 Ed. 1810.
2. "Rape of the Lock." Canto I No.323.
3. "Lampoon" written 1773.

and caricature made at their expense, women not only continued the outrageous mode, but now added hats of such enormous size that they were called "Mademoiselle Parapluie."[1] This mode began in 1787.

A more ridiculous fad than that of dress or hat was that of wearing the hair. The fashion was probably suggested by a "kind of one-horse chair or cabriolet" introduced, like most fads of the time, from France. Head-dresses were fashioned after its shape and immense size. A bit of verse called "A Modern Morning Writ," 1757, lampooned the mode:

> "Nelly!! why, where's the creature fled?
> Put my post-chaise upon my head."[2]

Various materials like, tow, hemp, pomatum, etc. were used to build the hair into a high tower. Over this was stretched upward the hair, augmented perhaps with a mass of false hair, until the structure often reached two feet above the head. This mass was puffed, and curled, and frizzed, and embellished with lofty plumes and flowers. Lines written in 1768 describe this ridiculous foppery:

> "When he views your tresses thin
> Tortur'd by some French friseur;
> Horse-hair, hemp, and wool within,
> Garnish'd with a diamond skewer;
> When he scents the mingl'd steam
> Which your plaster'd heads are rich in,
> Lard and meal, and clouted cream,
> Can he love a walking kitchen?"[3]

To make such a tower splendid and impregnable required hours of effort, and the help of an expert; hence the structure was left unchanged for weeks at a time, and its interior became a fit retreat for vermin. Consequently, strong perfumes were used plentifully to

1. "Caricature History of the Georges"- Thomas Wright. 1876. Vol. II p.312.
2. "Costume in England"- Fairholt. 1849.
3. "A New Foundling Hospital for Wit." Ode. 1768. See also - "Caricature History of the Georges" - Thomas Wright. pp.254-5. 1876.

kill the bad odors arising from the mass. An account is given of a head that was unchanged for nine weeks in the summer. When opened, the head was disgusting in its condition.[1]

It would be interesting to follow one of the male apes of fashion through a typical day of time killing. The coffee-house was established at an apportune time to afford a rendezvous for display and diversion to London gallants. At the Mermaid, Cock, Devil, White's, Will's, Dick's, the Kit-Kat Club, etc., the élite met, drank the new liquors - coffee and chocolate - played games of hazard, talked politics, gossiped about society and scandal, and made themselves generally conspicous by the smartness and richness of their dress, the sparkle of jewelry, the long plumes and fringed gloves, and the scent of cosmetics and orange-water. At night they filled the theatres, or continued their rounds of club or coffee-house. These loungers strolled and shifted from club to club, hour after hour, "to get over the insupportable labor of doing nothing;"[2] they were blessed with a means of livelihood without labor. It is interesting to note, as E.A. Roscoe observes, that these idlers ended their customs with the eighteenth century, and "belong to it wholly in temperament, in manners, and in mode of life."[3] Walter Besant follows two such parasites through the course of one day. At Inn-yards they drank wine with a company; at Bagnigge Wells they had a "gill of red-port;" at an Inn near St. Paul they took a pint of Lisbon; at Highgate they ordered dinner with a bottle of wine; on Hampstead Hill they bought a bottle of port; they visited Ranelagh and Vauxhall, where tea was served; now they returned to

1. "London Magazine." Aug. 1768.
2. "Spectator." No.54.
3. "The English Scene in the 18th Century." 1912.

Bagnigge Wells, where a bowl of negus was ordered; next they were at Kensington Gardens for a dish of coffee; then they went to "The Temple of Flora" to drink a bottle of wine; finally they ended at Bermadsey Spa Garden, where they indulged in a cherry brandy.[1] This was the experience of one day. The merrymakers consumed a large and varied quantity of drink. One wonders what turns the conversation took during this long, idle perambulation.

Bath was a popular place for dandies and fashionable women if they ever left London. We remember how in Humphrey Clinker Squire Bramble writes; "Every upstart of fortune, harnessed in the trappings of the mode, presents himself at Bath, as in the very focus of observation."[2] Hither the nouveau riche came to watch and to ape princes and dukes. Here ladies of fashion could exhibit their clothes to best advantage. Here, also, literary men found a rich field for the study of character, of manners, and of dress. Here Fielding, Smollett, and Jane Austen got materials for their novels; here Fielding, Foote, Sheridan, and other dramatists could analyze temperaments, motives, poses, and acts to be reproduced on the stage. Mrs. Barbeau wrote Swift in 1736, "My son, who is learning to paint, goes on well, and if he is in the least approved of, in all probability he may do well at Bath, for I never saw a painter that came hither fail of getting more business than he could do."[3] Here Baker, Lawrence, and Gainesborough painted much. Gainesborough spent fourteen years at Bath. And we know that Baker, Lawrence, and Gainesborough painted characters in conventional poses and settings, which are suggestive of type characters as represented

1. "London." Walter Besant. p.391,1903.
2. "Humphrey Clinker - Smollett." Letter of M.Bramble to Dr. Lewis, p.53. The Dalquhurn Ed. New York. 1908.
3. "Bath." Barbeau. English Ed., p.287.

in comedy. Nowhere were characters of a greater variety to be studied; nowhere was there a better place for the formation and discrimination of types characteristic of the eighteenth century, for here foreigners and natives mingled freely, and were in holiday mood. Merchants, enriched by the plunder of India; planters and negro-drivers from America; profiteers who had fattened on war profits; usurers, brokers, jobbers - all crowded this paradise of pride, vanity, and presumption; they "discharged their affluence without taste or conduct, through every channel of the most absurd extravagance." One wonders whether it was the "fribbles of court circles emulating these human fashion plates, or these in turn imitating the "fribbles."[1]

Travel also contributed not a little to the social and literary conditions of England in the eighteenth century. Had Charles not fled to the French court and been brought up there, England would perhaps never have abandoned herself to a reign of fashion as she did after Charles's return. But it was a usual thing for Englishmen of the upper classes to travel on the continent. Literature is full of accounts of such travels, and of the effect such absence from home had on the travelers after their return. "Little gad" spends a half-year in France and Italy. His periwig he bought in Paris, his cravat in Venice, his gloves in Rome, his waist-coat in Naples, his sword in Milan.[2] Etherege not only imitated Molière, but had visited him in Paris; hence "L'Etourde," "Le Dépit Amoureux," and "Les Précieuses Ridicules" meant much more to the writer of "The Comical Revenge" and "The Man of Mode" than they would other-

1. "Humphrey Clinker." Letter of M. Bramble to Dr. Lewis, Dalquhurn Ed. p.54.
2. "The Fortune Hunters'." James Carlyle, III,iii, 1689.

wise have. The visit enabled Etherege to understand Molière's characters the better, and thus to model his own types after the French the better. The Paris atmosphere was doubtless more congenial to the comic muse; Paris lacked the coarseness of beefeating London; in Paris the rude and boisterous notes of discord still present after civil war in England, were absent. Foote shows this difference between London and Paris:

> Buck - "Ah, quelle différence! The ease, the wit, the badinage, the persiflage, the double entendre, the chanson à boire! O what delicious moments have I passed chez madame la duchesse de Barbouliac!"[1]

Thus even in the middle of the eighteenth century the atmosphere of Paris was very different from that of London. The effect of this travel was not always for the best, no doubt; hence there was much lampooning and satirizing of "Frenchified" and "Italianated" Englishmen:

> "Trav'ling has so much improv'd our Beaux.
> That each brings home a foreign tongue or - nose."[2]

We must not think, however, that this travel was in the direction of the continent only. Frenchmen, Italians, and other continentals visited London. From these visits the non-traveling public could observe the difference between Frenchmen and the heavy English. Then too, French literary men had long been accustomed to visit England. In the sixteenth century Ronsard, Du Bartas, Jacques Grevin, Branôme, and others crossed the channel. Likewise in the seventeenth century London was honored with visits by Boisrobert, Voiture, Saint-Amant,Théophile de Vian; and Saint-Evremond lived in England many years.[3] The Count de Grammont was

1. "The Englishman Returned from Paris." I, i, 1736.
2. "Harlequin Horace: or the Art of Modern Poetry" (A Satire on Pope, Rich, Dennis, et al.) 1731.
3. "L'Influence Français en Angleterre au XVII e Siècle. Charlanne. p.28. 1906.

also quite closely identified with English life of the Capitol. Besides these, as we have already shown above, there were the dancers, fiddlers, tailors, friseurs, valet de chambres, cooks, etc., to say nothing of fake-doctors and other quacks, who flocked from France to London annually. It was a veritable May Fair - a wealth of material from which play-wrights might select the types they wished.

Colley Cibber wrote in 1756 that these Frenchmen of lower caste "must certainly enrich our nation," but he regretted that they soon put on "the habit of a Gentleman;"[1] for Cibber was apprehensive of this incursion of Celts, fearing that they would gain possession of English commerce, and would thus deprive England of much of her wealth and power. This fear was expressed by other English writers, and was one reason for the ridicule which was heaped on Frenchmen, and the treatment of them in drama as comic types. Defoe saw and regretted this English attitude. "The whole English nation," he wrote, "is a mix-up of Romans, Danes, Saxons, Normans, Welsh, Scots. From hence I only infer that an Englishman, of all men, ought not to despise foreigners."[2] He was especially provoked at all the lampoons and ballads against foreigners.

English writers were, however, fair in this, that they formulated types also of their own eccentric peoples, and caricatured their clumsiness, stupidity, and folly. They exhibited to the amusement of English spectators the Sir Tunbellies, the Betty Hoydens, the Miss Prues, the Sir Novelties, and others. Besides,

1. "Two Dissertations on the Theatres." Part II.
2. "Explanation." Preface. 1893-1903.

as Crowne avers, a fault of the British was that "they hate no man more than he who abounds in that, for which they wou'd have themselves esteemed."[1] The English have always been divided between a "wish to admire and a tendency to detest us," says Bastide.

In tracing in England during the eighteenth century the social conditions that contributed to the treatment of foreign type characters in comedy, we must not overlook the rise of woman, and her gradual assuming of a responsible position in affairs. The eighteenth century was in England a period of changes, and among the changes woman gained greater freedom, greater power, greater opportunities. Conditions among the middle classes were becoming better; money became more plentiful through commerce and manufacture; servants were plentiful for house-work, since foreign women, as well as men, were flocking to London. Thus, relieved of the cares in the home, many English women sought life outside. The result was women's clubs, tea-gardens (for fortunately tea, like coffee and chocolate, had been recently introduced into England), and shopping. Card-playing became a mania with women at home and in the clubs; tea drinking by women was growing into a fad, as was coffee-drinking by men; and shopping became an absorbing diversion with women, - often with no thought of buying, - for they were becoming almost as foppish, and quite as bent on display of clothes and person, as were the French dandies whom they imitated. These women, feeling their emancipation more and more, would enter, whole-souled, into the amusing spectacle of display. The effect must have been amusing to men and women alike. Woman was coming into her own; and

1. "The Country Wit." In Dedication of The Country Wit to The Right Hon. Charles, Earl of Middlesex. John Crowne. 1675.

and where this obtains, comedy must result, for she meets man on equal footing. In "The Maid of Oakes," we have this statement; "Civility may be very proper in a mercer, when one is choosing a silk, but familiarity is the life of good company...this is greatest improvement the beau monde ever made...I mean that participation of society, in which the French used to excel, and we have now so much outdone our models...Our men and women are put more upon a footing together in London, than they ever were before in any age or country."[1] Greek comedy had treated women "with copious abuse," for the Greeks assumed their inferiority; English comedy of the eighteenth century treated them more like equals, and English comedy, therefore, became more social. The reason why these comedies in higher life are so pleasing was that women were introduced to the stage and were fond of dramatic representations.[2]

To be sure, woman still lacked education to compete fully with man as a comic character; but schools for women were being established. To these every tradesman sent his daughter to be educated, "not in the useful attainments necessary for humble life, but in the arts of coquetry and self-esteem, in short, the arts of a lady."[3] In this capacity the young woman was already aping delightfully the foppery of the élite. In these schools she learned a smatter of French, a bit of painting, dancing, and a few other fripperies, but especially the newest art of dress. Relieved of physical labor, moreover, mother and daughter now

1. "Maid of Oakes", John Burgoyne. II,i, 1774.
2. "New History of the English Stage." Fitzgerald. Vol. I, Chap. IV 1882.
3. "Anecdotes of the Manners and Customs of London During the 18th Century." James Peller Malcolm. Vol. II,p.328, 1807.

could cultivate the little ailments coincident with an indolence to which they were not bred up. Thus they must flock to watering-places. "Spas" and "Baths" were so fashionable, and of course a sure cure for their troubles. Hither all flocked to drink of the waters and to bathe in the medicinal pools. Even wives and daughters of low tradesmen got the craze, and helped to fill these resorts.

Moreover, at these watering places were found the best marketing for unmarried women. The English have been called a match-making nation. Why else did ambitious mothers go to Spa or Bath than to make good matches for their daughters? Novels and dramas of the century are full of these subtle little plot-weaving designs to ensnare the desirable male. In ball-room, drawing room, at dinner, in the country, the theatre, the church there was ever busy this maternal diplomacy. But then, are not the most English comedies of manners written during the eighteenth century based on some such maternal "scheme and ambush" in behalf of daughter? This is the result of the new social mingling, of the desire by one class to rise to a par with another class. Here, then, are women usingtheir wits in a contest with men; and when women meet men in such conflict on equal footing, the situation is ideally comic.

To appreciate the richness of this social intermingling and asparation as a field for comedy development, and as a source of comedy types, we must consider the state of society from which some of these people emerged during the Restoration. The lower classes were ignorant, dirty, brutal. Such as were respectable and industrious, were perhaps puritanic and retiring, virtues which would

exclude them from social consideration. Many were improvident, lacked every quality that made for social progress. They drank to excess, spent their nights in brawls, and filled alms-houses and jails. Crime was common among them. "Corruption of the governing classes, and bitter social and religious antagonism among the people themselves, caused a sense of disillusionment through England."[1] People therefore did all that puritanism had formerly opposed; they played with madness. With peace came a reaction; a new prosperity followed. The presence of people from other lands in ever increasing numbers soon gave these lower strata of life in London a new interest, a new outlook on life. There was novelty here. A variegated world was in their midst. The unruly turbulence of a common "ale-house" may have been shocking; but the stupidity, pride, contempt, and indifference of upper classes, their vices, coarse jests, and profanity, did not raise them in the estimation of the lower. An array of class against class was the result; a feeling by the lower ranks that, after all they were about as good as those who held themselves superior, naturally followed. Thus the lower orders ridiculed but aped the upper; the upper ridiculed and disdained the lower, but could not shake them off. Everywhere were classes mingling, jostling, noting. Every day was a May Fair. We have here in actual life the Comedy of Errors, the Much Ado about Nothing. Here was a fine field for type study; and play-wrights from Etherege and Shadwell to Sheridan, were not slow to take advantage of it.

1. "Cambridge History of English Literature." H. V. Routh. Vol. IV p.381.

The most important social class, so far as our study is concerned, was, however, the middle class - for a middle class was taking shape and asserting itself after the Restoration. This has been called the most important fact in English history during the eighteenth century.[1] This class, as Leslie Stephen observes, was beginning to read, and to read what it liked. It showed the boldness, energy, ambition, egotism, and originality of the pioneer in any new field.[2] Lecky tells us that before the close of the seventeenth century, there was in England an "almost uninterrupted material prosperity," due to the reclaimation of waste lands, the development of colonies, and the freedom from serious wars. In this prosperity the new middle class took a prominent share. Besides, as wealth and success came, came also new avenues for social climbing. Gentlemen in England began to bind their sons as apprentices to rich merchants, and intermarriage of the aristocracy and merchant class followed. Wealth became the step to a title. Then prosperity brought extravagant tastes, and tastes had to be indulged. Now even the merchants' clerks had "their fine night-gowns; their chocolate in the morning, and their green tea two hours after; turkey polts for their dinner; and their perfumes, washes, and clean linen, equip them for the Parade."[3] The common Englishman began to realize that England belonged to him; that the King had little power; that the people ruled England;" that wealth is the greatest of all levelers;" that the humblest shop-keeper could grow rich, could send his son to Oxford or Cambridge; that to become Lord Mayor or Lord Bishop

1. "The Life of Wesley," C. T. Winchester.
2. "English Literature and Society in the 18th Century," Leslie Stephen, Chap. IV passim, 1903.
3. "Anecdotes of the Manners and Customs of London during the 18th Century," J. Peller Malcolm, Vol. I, p. 237.

was within the reach of any capable, ambitious young fellow.

From these changes it would seem that castes in England were breaking down, and with the caste system, also formality, convention, conformity; that thus types must in consequence themselves vanish. This did not, however, follow. Where social classes were strongly marked, as in Spain, Germany, and Russia, type characters in literature were lacking. Nowhere is consciousness of a caste system weaker than where the caste system is strongest, for people are so accustomed to their station that they rarely think of rising out of it; and nowhere is it so little understood, and so little thought of, as where rank is strongly marked. Intercourse is necessary if human beings are to understand each other: such understanding is necessary to humor; and humor is necessary to the formation of characters into comic types. In Germany of the eighteenth century, for instance, where caste chiefly lived, married, and visited with its own caste, literary types are wanting; in England, where the fusion of all classes, each with the other, was general, where the lowest aspired to be highest, and often became so, types were everywhere recognized. In Germany the lower strata knew the upper so little that they stood in awe of them; in England they knew the upper so well that they laughed at them, and both became conscious of the ludicrous situation. Besides, since types are the result, in part, of extravagance in fashions and manners, they can obtain best where there may be such extravagance, i,e., such deviation from the norm. In Germany fashions were fixed with the "stubborn circumvallation" of rank, and were nugatory in their influence;

in England they changed with the caprice of leaders, and ever had their swarm of worshippers- cluster about a common shrine - little conventions, petty formalities, harmless diversions, the very matter from which comedy grows. This contest of the low with the high toward a leveling, like the contest of women with men for equality, created an impish spirit of mirth, for it broke down artificial barriers - barriers once held adamant, but in fact so unreal as to arouse mirth when they fell. Don Quixote had returned to storm windmills. The "high and mighty" did not indeed like this irreverence; but it lent amusement to the multitude; it inspired optimism and good cheer in the ambitious masses.

What effect did this kaleidoscopic society have on the stage? We may answer this in part by showing first what effect the stage had on this society. In a highly organized and stratified society, each stratum will get from the play those elements which enter most intimately into the experience of that stratum; cultivated audiences would appreciate high comedy and the masses would prefer the farces of Harlequin. We wonder, however, judging from the character of eighteenth century comedy, whether the play was really "the thing" that occupied the spectator's attention at the theatre. In commenting on audiences at Opera during the eighteenth century - and the same must have held true more or less at plays - Hazlitt declares that the men in the pit cared neither for ballet nor for music. They were "solely thinking how they themselves look, whether their coat is of the right cut, their cravat properly tied, and whether their next neighbor is good enough for them to speak to."[1] If the

1. "Company at Opera"- Wm. Hazlitt. London 1889.

pit was so absorbed in its own appearance, what can we say of the boxes? As for the women, continued Hazlitt, they "loll and laugh and stare without meaning."[1] In the lobbies, moreover, intrigue, dress, gossip, insensibility occupied the women. The Critical Review, 1756, took a very pessimistic view of the theatre spectators, saying that London "indulges the most paltry entertainments, and that at these the people looked on in passive indolence." It quotes Cibber as saying that only idle amusement took most spectators to the theatre - "humour, leisure, indolence, or fashion." The greatest absurdities often won the greatest applause. Such was the effect the stage had on the public. It served as a place for display - to see and be seen. It indeed held the mirror up to nature; and in the mirror the play-wright himself saw what needed only to be reflected, and reproduced in drama, to please his public. Accordingly the dramatist held up to view the virtues and vices of John Bull; and in the design an array of characters, manners, and fashions pass before us.

Thus did the conventions of the eighteenth century take form; thus were the court, society, and the home revealed; thus their habits, their dress, their aims, were set forth in essay, novel, and drama.

We may well consider the relation of essay and novel, as well as of drama, to our discussion of eighteenth century types. The essay is indeed a contemporary in the period under discussion. It took its rise in the sixteenth but flourished in the seventeenth century; and it was perfected as a literary type in the eighteenth, by Defoe, Steele and Addison. It was itself a form, convention, or

1. "Company at Opera." Wm. Hazlitt. London, 1889.

type. Moreover, the eighteenth century essay was, first, skillfull in portraying characters; and, secondly, skillfull in portraying characters of certain odd traits or proclivities. The characters of the de Coverley Papers, for instance, are as sharply drawn as are dramatis personae on the stage. Sir Roger, Captain Sentry, Will Wimble, the Parson, Will Honeycomb -- each has his own eccentric bent which marks him as a man apart, as a member of a distinct type. It was the "mental atmosphere," says Roscoe, which united these"livid types" into living beings.[1] They seem, therefore, to have been created as types, before they were made human. In other words, they are in keeping with the general tendency - conformity to type - so common to that age. We might designate these characters as human beings of certain interests, occupations, or professions who were set up as typical of those interests or occupations, Each was thus made representative of a class. Sir Roger was the typical country squire; Freeport, the typical merchant. In each case the author makes his character act before us much as does the character in drama, for he so vividly and vivaciously describes the character, that we all but hear him speak. Like the comedy of manners, the essay aimed to criticise by skillfull portrayal, but not to preach; it was literary and artistic, but not didactic - not primarily so.

The eighteenth century novel, like the essay, falls into distinct types. We have epistolary novels, sentimental novels, lachrymose novels, Gothic romances, novels of manners, French romances. In the novels of Fielding the characters are formal and conventional, coming from much the same mold as do the characters

1. "The English Scenes in the 18th Century." p.158, 1912.

in Addison's or Steele's essays. There is Mr. Allworthy, who reminds one of Addison's great-hearted country gentleman, Sir Roger, there is the typical roaring fox-hunter, Squire Western; there is the pedant Thwackum. Even Goldsmith must treat types, as in the case of the fop Beau Tibbs, in his essay The Chinese Philosopher, and the Vicar, Mr. Primrose, in The Vicar of Wakefield.

As did the novel of the eighteenth century, so also the drama fell into distinct types - sentimental comedy, lachrymose comedy, comedy of manners. As did the essay and the novel, so the comedy exhibited on the stage the typical characters of the time, even as it did in the time of Ben Jonson. The theatres of the time were little "passing shows," glimpses of London herself. Thither all classes flocked; there they took stock of themselves; they were the center of social London. On the stage London society every day met with those that were "as ridiculously affected as Lord Foppington, as stupidly vicious as Lord Brute, as fawning as Lord Plausible, as impertinent as Novel, as impatiently fond as Limberman, as treacherous as Maskwell, as superstitious as Foresight, as subtle as Volpone, as humoursome as Morose, as silly as Sir Martin, as hypocritical as Tartuff, and as jealous as Fondle-Wife."[1] "Ralph the Historian" speaks for his own time; he saw it. Each of his dramatic characters represents a type of London citizenship. As in Jonsonian comedy, each individual marks a distinct trait of character, each shows a type of English people. Mr. Waterhouse calls the eighteenth century comedy a continuation of the Jonsonian; "both," he says, "are incarnations of humours."[2] Both

1. "The Taste of the Town: or a Guide to All Public Diversions." by "Ralph the Historian," p. 78, 1731.
2. "Anglia," XXX, 1907, Osborn Waterhouse.

are periods of extravagance, of artificiality. There was the extravagance in sentiments, extravagance in taste, in dress, in manner, in speech; extravagance in emotions. It was an age of emotions run riot, an age that had lost control of itself, and was struggling to regain its feet; but while people were groping and stumbling in an effort to regain themselves and to rise, their oddities were picked up by witty dramatists and portrayed on the stage. "Artificiality of sentiment and expression causes a decay of comedy....and types accompany decline of comedy,"[1] says Professor Routh; and The Critical Review of 1760 held that "Comedy.... has ever excelled in those periods when a people just begins to rise." Thus, during the eighteenth century, both in the decline of society and in society's attempt to regain itself, the field was ripe for type representation.

Comedy of manners is the name that applies to all comedy of the period, for all comedy, to a greater or less degree, represents the artificial, conventional manners of the time. Sentimental comedy is a type that shot off from the comedy of manners, and is characterized by fine sentiments, lofty ideals, aphoristic precepts, and a moralizing that is, perhaps, somewhat maudlin. It begins with Colley Cibber's "Love's Lost Shift," 1696, and was considered a great success at the time, for it was held a "new glorification of goodness of heart." The sentimental school progressed slowly, and finally ended with Kelly and Cumberland in the latter half of the century. Sentimental plays finally became so tragically pathetic that they crowded out every trace of reality. The type also became so fixed and formal in time that play after play scarcely

1. "Cambridge History of English Literature" - H. V.Routh. IV. p. 381.

deviated in technique or character delineation. "Three types of character almost invariably appear" - the hero, a sort of "edition de luxe" of the medieval Sir Galahad,[1] and, probably, the writer's ideal young man; the heroine, who seemed constantly in trouble; and the old gentleman, who was a sort of echo of the "old-man" stock character in Plautus. Kelly and Cumberland employed a fourth type, the foreigner - Jew, Irishman, or Scotchman, - whom they determined to defend against what they held to be unjust ridicule by spectators of the past. Hence "Teague" is no longer an Irish scoundrel, but a self- sacrificing hero; "Sandy" is now not a scheming sycophant, but an honest, philanthropic idealist; "Isaac" ceases to be the thieving usurer, and appears a self-appointed benefactor of humanity. These reconstructed types now moralize on human responsibility; and the other characters of the play reward them with encomium. The characters in many of these plays finally become so soft in fibre as to be mere sugar-coated replicas of characters in the old Morality plays; their will gives way to "spasmodic impulse." These plays finally become a mere drowning of the stage in tears.

Finally the English public tired of the sentimental and lachrymose. "The Sublime of a Shakespeare, the Tenderness of an Otway, and the Humour of a Vanbrugh,"[2] also being represented "to empty benches," the drama almost disappeared from the stage of London. People now flocked to Harlequin shows, to tricks of Gypsy or buffoon, to the tumbler and the pantomine,

1. "Waterhouse in Anglia," XXX. 285.
2. "Letter to Lord Talbot." James Miller, 1729.

resurrections of the pantaloons, scaramouche, or medical quack. Rich conceived the idea of acting Harlequin as a "relief for tedious mythological dramas then played."[1] The Harlequin was popular in Paris in the early eighteenth century, and had already got a hold on English spectators. These shows mark the low taste of theatre-going London. According to Disraeli, "The Harlequin must be modeled as a national character, the creature of manners; and thus the history of such a Harlequin might be that of the age of the people whose genius he ought to represent."[2] Let it be noted, that Disraeli calls the Harlequin a "Creature of manners," a designation which makes the type conform well with the age. It had arisen in Italy as a low buffoon, later assumed more power and individuality, and finally had sunk back again into low buffoonery. In England it was represented at its best.

No doubt the theatre audiences themselves served as an excellent field from which to select human types for plays. If we are to judge from the statements of "Ralph the Historian," the theatre was in itself a "Passing Show"[3] of interest. The crowding of the pit by pater familias with his whole family from Cheapside or Ludgate Hill, all of whom indulged in snatches of bread or meat at intervals during the play, when "Shakespearean climaxes" were"neglected for the Leg of a cold Pullet, or a Naples Biscuit," was at least novel;[4] the noisy young dandies who "hired Swords at some neighboring Cutler's, in order to appear as Gentlemen," gave a touch of

1. "Annals of the Convent Garden Theatre"- Henry Saxe Wyndham. Vol. I p. 16-18, 1732-1897.
2. "The Pantomimical Characters." - Isaac Disraeli, Vol. IV. p. 189, Ed. 1823.
3. "The Taste of the Town." Vol. V p. 139, ff.
4. Ibid.

the martial; the gallants from "the other end of the Town," calling out in jest to the neighboring boxes, or even to the actors on the stage, to show their own wit and to attract attention, would add zest to the occasion; women of different classes, to show how clever women had grown, pressing themselves into your acquaintance, and communicating to you the secrets of the whole family, must have satisfied the most curious spectators; the young daughter's tattle about the latest scandal or the newest fashion or the last game of cards, would fittingly complete the "variety show."[1] "What, after all, are Cleopatra's Misfortunes to an ill run at Quadrille, of Basset! tho' all the world was lost for Love?"[2] and we may answer, what indeed? "An assembly at my Lady Hazard's - a Drawing-room Night - a new Gown to be shown there - or an Appointment at Mrs. -- or at Madam --- or at my lady----"[3] well these are essentials in "Vanity Fair." Then certain young Bucks must pass their time behind the scenes, or obstruct the view of the audience, or interfere with the actors, thinking that the glare of the stage-lights would make their powder, brocade, and embroidery show to greater advantage. Thus one class could see the absurdities of another; and be amused; and thus the play-wright could see the absurdities of all, made clearer by juxtaposition and contrast, and could select from each class such typesas seemed most representative. If all men were boastful soldiers, the "miles gloriosus" would probably not have been recognized as a type; but the modest and unwarlike ancient gentleman, out of dislike for this class of man, had him exhibited on the stage that society might join

1. "The Taste of the Town," op. cit.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.

in ridiculing the monster.

But the taste of the time was to sink still lower. "Have we not had a greater number of those unmeaning fopperies, mis-called entertainments, than was ever known to disgrace the stage in so few years?" asks The Critical Review in1758. This periodical calls them "patch-work pantomines, masquing mummeries, ribaldry, buffoonery, nonsence, puppet-shows, idle amusements for children and holiday fools." Added to this was the mania for dancing. In 1702 pantomine dancers appeared at Drury Lane, in what was called The Tavern Bilkers.[1] In 1717 a variety of dancers was introduced from France. Soon matters became so bad that the reputable theatres were deserted. "The actors," Cibber remarked, "were very near being wholly laid aside, or... their labor was to be swallowed up in the pretended merit of singing and dancing."[2] Then the Italian dancers were added. They showed such great agility and expressive action, look, and motion, that they excited much surprise. The Gentleman's Magazine, however, thought it "beneath the character of a Britain to wish to see his Countrymen endued with such Genius."[3] In addition to these, "dumb-shows" had been introduced sometime before, which showed "how much Folly and Stupidity prevailed over Reason and good Sense," we are warned by The Gentleman's Magazine.[4] "Harlequin, Morris Dancers, and Ballad" were "preferred to the noblest and instructive entertainments, the Magazine adds. Now came Turkish rope-dancers, "hairy woman" shows, and ape dancers, the last "gallantly clad a la mode."

1. "Letter in the London Chronicle," signed "Theatricus," Vol. XV,
2. January, 1717, ibid.
3. "Gentleman's Magazine," 1741.
4. Ibid., 1732.

Taste seems now to have reached its lowest ebb. By 1744 Harlequin and jugglery finally degraded legitimate drama to mere farce. For a time short farces like Foote's held the stage. Then, with these farces as a model, there was a slow but gradual return to real drama. Foote used his farces to satirize the tendency of the times, to treat "on the stage in comedies and pantomines, as objects of satire, the passing events."[1] Thomas Wright called Foote the "great theatrical caricaturist of the age."[2]

The tendency to formalize, conventionalize, and make typical was carried to absurdity during the eighteenth century. It may have been by way of satire on the folly itself; but at any rate, we now have the theatre divided into architectural details to conform with classes of spectators. "Ralph the Historian" gives us the following outline:

> "First, then, I shall strive to bring the several Degrees that compose a regular Audience, to bear upon the Parallel with the four principal Orders of Architecture. Under the Dorick and Ionick, I comprehend the Pit and first Galleries, I looking upon them as the most plain, solid and substantial Basis of an Audience, intermix'd with some People polite, and of good Fashion, who resemble the Ionick: Then the Dorick, allowing of some Asses or Goats Heads in the Corinth, by way of Ornament, that refers to the critical Part of the Order; Boxes being some steps higher, and altogether formed in a genteeler and more elegant Taste than the former, I fix them as my

1. "England under the House of Hanover," Vol.II, p. 351, Ed. 1848.
2. Ibid.

Corinthian, that Order being very beautiful and design'd much for Shew: Then the upper Galleries answer exactly to the Composite, and that Order differing from the Corinthian chiefly by the Capitol, I judge it thus: that part which is modest, I borrow from the Ionick in the Pit; the other is entirely Corinthian, either as they belong to that Order in the Boxes, or as their Capitols are generally cast in that Brass.

"The Pit then in the Play-Houses, and the first Gallery in the Opera, are supported either by some of our most substantial, plain, sober Tradesmen, their Wives, and Children, in Dorick Style, or by Officers of the Army, Members of Parliament, and Gentlemen of good Character and pleasant Fortunes in the Ionick; with a few Criticks who are divided betwixt the two. By gentle Assent, I soon arrive at the Station of the Corinthian Order, which includes the Pit and Boxes at the Opera, and Front and Side Boxes at the Play-House, with some inconsiderable Stragglers behind the Scenes, and the Flying Squadron, who scorn to be settled anywhere. We look upon the Natives of this Region, as so many small Divinities; the Ladies, from the Lustre of their Jewels, and the Power of their Eyes; the Men, from the Fame of their Places, Titles, and Fortunes. During the Time of the Representation the Ladies are so employ'd in finding out all their Acquaintance, Male and Female, lest a Bow, or Curtsy should escape them; criticizing on Fashions in Dress, whispering cross the Benches, with

significant Nods, and Hints of Civil Scandal of this, and that, and t'other Body... While the Belles are ogling the Beaux and the Beaux admiring themselves, the Affairs of real Moment are entirely neglected."[1]

All this is, of course, purely whimsical. It means nothing, and yet it shows how the eighteenth century thought. It shows the tendency to classify, to order, to formalize, to typify. We wonder whether the "few Criticks" mentioned in this account were not play-wrights who went from theatre to coffee-houses, drawing-rooms, and clubs to discuss the classes of humanity, their fads, fancies, and follies, to fit each man into his respective type, and to reproduce him on the stage the next week; for "Ralph the Historian" tells us that "the Chocolate and Coffee-Houses, the Drawing-rooms, the Assemblies, the Toilets, the Tea-tables are the Judgement-Seats where Poetry and Music are try'd."[2] At any rate, certain types represented on the stage were drawn from real life; for we learn that the "elderly lover," Flint, in The Maid of Bath, was a Mr. Long, and that "Major Mathews," a sort of Don Juan at Bath, was the original of "Major Rocket" in the same play.[3]

Type characters would probably not have become so popular and so general had there not been so many superbly gifted actors ready at the moment to personate them. The types were conceived from time to time to fit the particular personality or ability of some great actor. As early as 1663, James Nokes was called by Charles II to play the fop in Sir Solomon, a

1. "The Taste of the Town - A Guide to all Public Diversions," "Ralph the Historian," Chap. V, 1731.
2. Ibid.
3. "Samuel Foote," 1771.

burlesque on L'Ecole des Femmes, when the King wished to entertain the Queen-mother at Dover. Cibber, from 1691 to 1713, originated nearly eighty characters, chiefly "grand old fops," impudent lackeys, and foolish old men, the characters that he could best impersonate, chief of which were Sir Courtly Nice, Shallow, and Fondle-Wife. Mr. Mountford was another famous "fop" actor. Doggett acted Irish parts, especially the more vulgar and farcical, from 1691 to 1713, in which he completely lost his own identity for the "brisk, vain, rude, and lively coxcomb, the false, flashy pretender to wit."[1] Macklin, himself an Irishman, was best in the Scotch Sir Pertinax, and in Irish characters, and so was in great demand at Lincoln's Inn Fields up to 1731. Mr. Robert Boddeley was noted for his foreign personages, the Jew, the Welshman, and the Frenchman, in acting which he excelled. One of his was the Welsh "Dr. Druid," in Cumberland's Fashionable Lovers. Lacy was the favorite actor of Charles II in the Irish "Teague" parts. His role was foreign types - French,Scotch, and Irish.

Among the women actors we find the same to obtain as among the men. Mrs. Mountford, from 1682 on, was the best coquette and country dowdy on the stage. Nell Gwyn enacted certain little sparkish parts superbly, and the play-wrights constantly created parts for her, because of her immense popularity. Mrs. Bracegirdle and Mrs. Oldfield were two actresses for whom parts were created; and Kitty Clive, who acted up to 1769, was excellent and versatile in the roguish chambermaid, the hoyden, etc. Then we must not forget Peg Woffington,

1. "Hours with the Players," Dutton Cook, 1883.

whose forte was Lady Townley and Lady Betty Modish. Some of these actors and actresses were also play-wrights; accordingly, it was only natural for them to create the characters which they could best enact.

The tendency to form types that characterized the century, is further illustrated in the drawings and paintings of the time. Among these, Hogarth's were preëminent. What dramatists did on the stage, Hogarth did with colors. He visited the coffee-houses, the taverns, the theatres, and the public gardens, just as did the play-wrights of the time, to study English life: and he depicted this English life, its humors and its eccentricities, for the amusement of the English public, much as did the play-wrights. He drew the French dancing master and fencing-master, or quack doctor and quack lawyer as examples of peculiar types of London life. Walpole spoke of him "rather as a writer of comedy with a pencil than a painter."[1] Another writer asserted that Hogarth "composed comedies as much as Molière; that he was more true to character than Congreve; that each of his personages was as "distinct from the rest, acts in his sphere, and cannot be confounded with any other of the dramatis personae."[2] Still another writer called Hogarth's "comedy... as well drawn as anything in Molière."[3] We thus find him compared by his contemporaries, with Molière, the great French creator of types, with the man who, perhaps, influenced the eighteenth century English tendency to type treatment. Speaking of his own work,

1. "Anecdotes of Painting," Vol. IV, 1771.
2. "Introduction to Hogarth's London," Henry B. Wheatly.
3. "Gray's Inn Journal," February, 9, 1754.

Hogarth said: "Let the figures in either pictures or prints, be considered as players dressed either for the sublime, - for genteel comedy, or farce, - for high or low life. I have endeavoured to treat my subjects as a dramatic writer; my picture is my stage, and men and women my players, who by means of certain actions and gestures, are to exhibit a dumb show."[1] He accordingly thought of himself as a dramatist. He used color instead of language to exhibit his characters; but his characters are, none-the-less, as true to types of contemporary English life as are those of Etherege, of Steele, or of Sheridan.

We may mention "Punch" as another example of eighteenth century types depicted in color. "Punch" is a distinct echo, if I may use the phrase, of the Italian Pantomimical characters, of Harlequin, Scaramouche, etc., of those types among Italian lower classes that lent their influence later to English treatment of foreign types in comedy. The silent gestures of "Punch's" figures are as full of wit and humor, as expressive of thought, as indicative of character, as were the spoken sentences and bodily poses of comedy actors. These caricatures of Hogarth, "Punch," and others, were very popular during the eighteenth century; during the last quarter of the century they became a veritable rage; then they died away after the reign of George III, to be revived later in the nineteenth century.

The eighteenth century tendency to formulate types is also exemplified in other fields of art - portrait painting, classical architecture, formal gardens. The portraits of

1. "Introduction to Hogarth's London," H. B. Wheatly, 1891.

Gainsborough, Reynolds, Lawrence, and Romney are representations of certain social types of time. They portray a distinct class of contemporary English life. These portraits as painted, and as set in their backgrounds, could not have obtained at any other period, any more than modern cubism, impressionism, futurism, obtain in any period except one of "jazz," of crude sculpture, of free verse. Each is typical of the time.

Formal gardens are a distinct eighteenth century type, an expression in external nature that runs parallel with the eighteenth century way of impressing its individuality in the portrayal of human nature, of literary forms, and of portrait painting and caricature. The century liked outward form; it liked pose, balance, symmetry; it liked to arrange, to order, to fashion, to classify; it liked to follow models. It was this proclivity of the age that made it group peoples, foreign and domestic, as it did in its comedies. In its formal gardens it followed the balance and symmetry of classical architecture; it arranged details in the same order of rank and straight line. It sought simplicity. The age liked to adjust things, that it might better regard them, the better evaluate them, for the eighteenth century loved to set a price on things and on people alike. Criticism, caricature, satire - so characteristic of the time - all prove the fact.

The tendency to designate character as well as type is likewise shown in the names selected for persons in drama, novel, or essay. In the essay, Tom Folio is parodied as a learned collector of books; Young Reptile must ever "mind

what passed;"[1] Tom Varnish, bright and smooth, "talks as well as any man in England;"[2] Will Honeycomb is "very ready at that sort of discourse with which men usually entertain women;"[3] Mrs. Spitely has "somthing to tell" about Mr. Froth;[4] Lady Hectic has a fever because her monkey jumps from a window.[5] The novel follows the same method of character naming: Jonathan Wild's career was wildness itself;[6] Dr. Slop was a blundering physician;[7] Roderick Random follows the random course of vagabond sailors;[8] even Dr. Primrose was just about what the name implies.[9] The novel of character must have been influenced by the essay of character; it was a vitalized type of the conventional character essay. The drama of the time naturally followed the same vogue. In fact, it anticipated the essay and novel in the use of the common conventions. Fondle-Wife,[10] Feignwell,[11] Lord Foppington,[12] Sir Courtly Nice,[13] Sir John Brute,[14] even Mrs. Malaprop[15] are labels to show how the dramatist will have each act in the play.

This tendency to label the character, as well as to fix the type, is also found in the titles of and the names of periodicals during the century. We have, for instance, the periodicals called "The Growler," "The Whisperer," "The Wanderer,"

1. "The Tatler," No. 132.
2. Ibid. No. 244.
3. "The Spectator," No. 2.
4. Ibid. No. 323.
5. Ibid.
6. "The Life of Mr. Jonathan Wild the Great," Fielding, 1743.
7. "Tristram Shandy," Sterne, 1760.
8. "Roderick Random," Smollett, 1748.
9. "The Vicar of Wakefield," Goldsmith, 1766.
10. "The Old Bachelor," Congreve, 1693.
11. "A Bold Stroke for a Wife," Mrs. Centlivre, 1717.
12. "The Relapse," Vanbrugh, 1696.
13. "Sir Courtly Nice," Crowne, 1685.
14. "The Provok'd Wife," 1697.
15. "The Rivals," Sheridan.

"The Observer," "The Lounger," as well as "The Tatler," "The Spectator," "The Idler." Each name is to be significant, in a way; but each shows primarily the prevailing tendency to symbolize in a name the character that is designated by the name.

Finally, the representation of type characters in eighteenth century English comedy was, perhaps, influenced by the practice of "Character" writing. This vogue of writing had reached its height in the seventeenth century in the persons of Bishop Joseph Hall, Sir Thomas Overbury, John Earle, and Samuel Butler. The personages represented as the "Characters" in these essays were chosen from far and wide; they represented men in various activities, and varied interests. These "Characters," moreover, also described the types so common on the comedy stage of the time - the tailor, the hypocrite, the saucy boy, the usurer, the parisite, the "Fantastic," the drunken Dutchman, the French cook, etc., etc. Let us consider Overbury's "Courtier" and Butler's "Fantastic." Both are characters very like the French "fop" of the eighteenth century. Overbury's "Courtier" is a highly dressed, highly perfumed individual; "he smels, and putteth away much of his judgement about the situation of his clothes. He does not rise until ten o'clock; his mind is filled with love intregues; he admires nothing but beauty."[1] Similarly, Butler's "Fantastic" is "sure to be the earliest in Fashion; he is a French dandy transferred to English soil; he "speaks French as Pedants do to shew his Breeding;"[2] he is a sort of walking dress model

1. "Picturae Loquentes, or Pictures drawne forth in Characters,"
2. "A Fantastic," from "Characters," Samuel Butler, 1667-69.

for others to imitate; he apes the fop in his very steps. Overbury's "Courtier," furthermore, paints, pads himself, and struts; he assumes an affected, euphuistic speech; he "lives in the flame of love;" he "sighs sweetly and speaks lamentably;" he is very fond of the dance. Earle's "Idle Gallant" is a character of the same stamp. Mr. R. Thayer called the writing of "Characters" "a Kind of Wit much in Fashion"[1] in the seventeenth century. We may judge of the popularity of this type of literature by the fact that Overbury's book went through fourteen editions before 1632, and Earle's through six in five years. This popularity may have suggested to dramatists an equal popularity for type characters in drama; for the "Characters" as treated in these early essays are very like those types found in the Restoration and eighteenth century drama. The same may be said of Ben Jonson and other writers of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century.

1. Preface to "The Genuine Remains," in Verse and Prose of Mr. Samuel Butler, 1759.

French Types as Represented.

Type characters are not indigenous to any race or soil. They are as ubiquitous as humanity itself. As literary influences pass from one country to another, and as people migrate, they carry type characters with them. In the new land the type is likely to be more marked, for he comes among a people that is different from those whom he left. The silly old man, called "heavy father" on the Latin stage, undoubtedly appeared still more silly to the Italian audience. Likewise, the Matamore, when transferred to the French stage, had an added element of humor, in that he was a Spanish or an Italian instead of a French captain. So also the French types, when they appeared in London, were fit subjects for comedy, not only because they were strange characters, but also because they were foreigners.

One of the reasons why foreign types, as represented in English comedy of the eighteenth century, were adopted on the English stage, was the aping of things foreign by the English people generally. Probably 1347 was the date when French customs were first copied in England - the time of the capture of Calais. For another hundred years, however, Italy was most instrumental in shaping English society. This was brought about by travel in Italy, and also by books, such as Castiglione's Il Cortegiano, which incorporated all the rules of conduct and dress for ladies and gentlemen. Indeed, the habit had grown so strong that even as late as Elizabeth, Ascham and Lyly protested against the wholesale aping of the Italians.

Italianated-English, like hyphenated-Americans to-day became a term of contempt. The Englishman seemed dissatisfied with everything English. Dekker, speaking of the English courtier, says that his doublet was French; his breeches, Italian; his cloak German; nothing but his face was English.

The more immediate source of English manners and customs, however, was the Louis XIV period of France. CharlesII had spent his youth and early manhood at the French court, amid the splendor of that extravagant age. There he tried to relieve the ennui of his care-free existence by means of theatrical diversions; and there he indulged his taste and fancy in elaborate dress. There it was also, says Louis Charlanne that the royal exiles preferred French and Spanish comedy to all others.[1]

With the return of Charles to England in 1660, England was to enter a new era, literary and social. During the first few years, Spanish comedy proved more ready and adaptable to English wants and tastes than did the French. It was copied. The result was a play of surprises and intrigues - a piece of incidents rather than character. The Spanish furnished plots; the French, manners. This Iberianated-French product found a congenial atmosphere in London. We find repeated in London what had taken place in Paris when Spanish influence was first felt there. Destouches gives us a picture of the French court, the unscrupulous favorite, and the "intrigante" as copied from the Spanish: -

> "Toujours rêveur toujours forinant quelque project
> Accablé de bienfaits, et jamais satisfait.
> Pour s'elêver sans cesse, il met tout en pratique
> L'Amour même en son coeur cède à sa politique.

1. "L'Influence Français en Angleterre au XVII e Siècle," Part II, chap. IX, p. 482.

Car c'est un courtisan plein de manège et d'art,
Dont l'air et les discours sont parés d'un beaufard! [1]

This French taste for Spanish plays of intrigue followed Charles and his court to London, and furnished their entertainment there. The Spanish play soon, however, gave place to a comedy inspired by Molière and other French play-wrights.

Court entertainment was not, however, the only thing imported from France. There was such a demand in England for French commodities that duties on imports were repealed, and the London shops were stocked with French wares, especially of wearing apparel - laces, embroideries, fans, gloves, in profusion. Then came the Frenchman himself: first servants, valets, and tutors; then a flood of others - adventurers, and men seeking new fields for exploitation or employment. The novelty at first amused the insular Britain, long chafing under Puritan restraint, and ready for anything new. The French and their wares were received with acclamation. London became a new Paris. Says Charlanne, "English merchants assumed French accents and tried to pass for Frenchmen in order to sell their wares."[2] The "uniform gray tint" of Puritan severity was put off and forgotten. Lest the common people be taken for Puritans, even they aped their betters. Apparently, the chief end was to be as fashionable as France.

Out of this social array, brilliant, fashionable, extravagant, and wholly artificial, was born a variety of characters which in due time were represented on the London

1. "L'Ambitieux et l'Indiscrete," I, i, 1737.
2. "L'Influence Français en Angleterre au XVII e Siècle," Pt. I, p. 45, 1906.

stage as typically French, and also as typical of certain French hangers-on or petty employees at court. Among these were the maid, the valet de chambre, the footman, the cook, the barber, the dancing-master, the tutor, the doctor, and, above all, the fop. As will be shown later, these characters, when formed into types, had associated with them some trait or tendency that was distasteful to the English, but perhaps true to the class of Frenchmen that frequented English shores for many years after the Restoration. Thus the valet is set forth as officious; the footman, as impudent; the dancing- master, as amourous; the doctor, as a faker; the barber as a bold adventurer.

A large number of the English comedies for many years after 1660 had among their dramatis personae one or more of these types. A character more frequently displayed than any of these, however, and one which was aped and personated even by valet, tutor, dancing-master, and others, was the fop. This tailor's model or dandy was the most distinctive, the most characteristic, outgrowth of the Louis XIV court as transplanted to England. We will therefore give him first consideration in the discussion.

The fop may be variously defined as a foll and a coxcomb; a conceited pretender to wit and wisdom; one superlatively vain of his appearance, dress, or manners; a dandy, an exquisite. He is, in short, a fantastical excrescence of a super-conventional court. There were women fops as well as men. In fact, the fop was not limited to England or France; the whole continent

had its fickle, capricious imitators of French courtliness. Even Germany became foppish. M. Antreau in Le Port-a-l'Anglois, 1718, shows us the Frenchified German:-

> "Un Allemand françaisé est au point que je souhaite. Il prend, ici, avec le tems, ses degrés de politesse, et quelque fois même de galanterie."

In 1727 another French play presents a German girl and her relative, an officer, as follows:-

> "Je n'en puis plus. Bon Dieu, qu'ils sont plaisance!
> La Baronne surtout qui vent faire l'aimable.
> Quelle affectation! Quel accent effroyable!
> Ciel! Comme elle est coeffee! Et son cousin Riter
> Qui parle son jargon, est encor mis d'un air"....[1]

Not only was the fop ubiquitous, but he also continued long on the stage. In England we find his career on the stage from Etherege's <u>She Would if She Could</u>,1668, to Frederick Reynold's <u>Notoriety</u>, 1793.

The fops were usually young sprigs of gentility - tutors, valets, barbers, and country squires. Except in the case of Sir Fopling Flutter in Etherege's <u>Man of Mode</u> and Lord Foppington in Vanbrugh's <u>The Relapse</u>, the fop was not a major character in English comedy. Usually he was not important enough to affect much either the complication or the resolution of the plot. Often he was merely a love-agent or some other link-personage. He carried letters and messages whereby other characters became involved and clashed; but as a direct means to the dénouement, his influence was not great. His purpose was to amuse, to add zest to the entertainment. Comedy of manners does not, after all, emphasize plot structure; its interest lies in situation and incident, in character and wit combat.

1. "L'Impertinent Malgre lui," - Boissey, I, i.

The return of Charles II and his court was not the only incentive to the treatment of the French fop in English comedy. Social conditions in London were conducive to the same end. Travel in France by Englishmen was common. The elite of England had flocked to France. Paris, the center of luxury and elegance, was their rallying place. The English courtier could there copy manners and dress in a congenial atmosphere. Besides, there was the French exile in London, who brought the taste of Paris with him. These expatriated foreigners afforded several type characters, in addition to the dandy, to English comedy. Wars between France and Holland, and between France and Spain, during the reign of Louis XIV, and after, caused many Frenchmen of all classes to seek refuge in England. Play-wrights speak of this fact. "Monsieur" in exile sees no reason why fortune should be kinder "to de Anglis chevalier dan to de French Marquis;"[1] and in Monsieur Tonson a little "Monsieur" sent by the Marquis de Courey to England for safety, is called "one of those pretty emigrants we have lately imported from Paris with other French toys."[2] Fickle men of fashion would be the very ones to try to escape the rigours of war in France by fleeing to London.

The English were quite ready to adopt French manners and customs. It was the fashion to do so. In fact, not to imitate, cast suspicion on a person; he might be a Puritan. There had been enough restraint during twenty years of

1. "Sir Harry Wildair," - Farquhar, III, i, 1701.
2. "Monsieur Tonson," W.T. Moncrief, Act I, i,

Cromwell's rule. The civil war had emancipated the individual Englishman enough to make him chafe under restraint. Why should he not be gay and elegant in the midst of a brilliant circle where each day fêtes succeeded fêtes, where the elegance of the court made assaults of elegant coquetry, where gentlemen assumed airs of fine taste in the choice of their costumes, the fine dresses that came from France?[1] As at the court of Louis XIV, we now see in England "men and women playing the fool deliciously" - pomp, court-airs, court dresses, laced ruffles, jewels; the struts, the bows, the perfume. Happy time! "Enviable time to think of!"[2] exclaims Hazlitt. England lost her plainness. It had been an age of crudeness. "Those who traveled abroad regretted the absence of refinement in English manners."[3] At once the Englishman became a prig in dress and manners. What! did he address you in a coat not worth looking at? What a shabby wretch! says a man at a dance. "The macaronis were imitated at more or less distance by all who affected the 'ton."[4] "We are naturally prone to imitate the French in their fashions, manners, and customs, let them be ever so vicious, fantastic, and ridiculous," we read in The Rehearsal.[5]

One type of French fop may be classed as the foolish old man. He is not, indeed, the pantaloon of classical comedy, for he differs from his forbear of "the lean and slipper'd with spectacles on nose," who was content to act the part of

1. "Memoirs du Chevalier de Grammont" - Hamilton, Vol.I, ChapVI.
2. "Lectures on Wycherley" - Congreve, et al, 1889.
3. "Social England," H.D. Trail, p. 184.
4. Ibid. p. 479, 1894-97.
5. "The Rehearsal," George Villiers, 1672.

an old man, in that he simulates the young bucks of gallantry. He might be called the pantaloon in an age of manners; for in England the "old fool" was often more flippant than his son. So we find the old dandy of Etherege, Sir Frederick, woo prettily, play the gallant, and indulge in witticisms about women.[1] We have old Lackbut, December in his face and heels, but May in his fancy dress, who admires the newest French fashions, is always the most tawdry of the company, and loves operas, balls, and masquerades.[2] These men believed with Lord Chesterfield that it is boorish to accost a friend on his approaching marriage with: "I wish you joy." One should say rather: "Believe me, my dear sir, I have scarce words to express the joy I feel upon your happy alliance with such and such a family." They would, like Lord Doricourt, go into ecstasy over a pair of eyes: "She should have spirit! fire! l'air enjoüé...why, I have known a French-woman indebted to nature for no one thing but a pair of decent eyes, reckon in her suite as many counts, marquesses, and petit-maitres as would satisfy three dozen of our first-rate toasts."[3]

It did not perhaps come amiss, this fact that the English so aped the French, if we are to accept evidences of English backwardness and crudeness. In fact, England as a whole does not seem to have improved her manners much even late in the century. Wycherley, in 1673, ridiculed her backwardness. "Why," says Monsieur, "his tailor lives within Lydgate, his valet de chambre is no Frenchman, and he has been seen at [4]

1. "Comical Revenge," I, ii, 1669.
2. "A Bold Stroke for a Wife" - Mrs. Centlivre, I, i, 1718.
3. "The Belle's Stratagem," - Mrs. Cowley, I, ii, 1781.
4. "The Gentleman Dancing Master," I, i.

noon-day to go into an English eating-house." Wycherley goes on to say of the Englishman, that he could not dance, nor sing a French song, nor swear a French oath, nor speak in French; and that he did not carry about a snuff-box. In fact, he spoke "base, good English with the home-bred pronunciation." This does not at all seem a discreditable shortcoming to us to-day; but to a courtier in the time of Charles II, it must have appeared unpardonable. The only remedy for such crudeness was tutelage in the French school of courtliness. Let the boorish Britain go abroad; then note the change. "What a great revolution in this family!" cries Miss Tittup. "We went out of England a very awkward, regular, good English family, but a half year in France, and a winter in Italy, have ripened our minds to every refinement."[1] After a hundred years, England still lacks French finesse. The adamantine Anglo-Saxon seems to have taken on a polish slowly.

The French were willing to admit these imperfections of the English. In a French work of 1764, a character, Delonaville, observes: "If we only call to mind all those virtues which they (the English) are ignorant, and all those vices which they posses, the sum total will be that they are not only savages, but savages of most barbarous caste."[2] The French were also willing to act as tutors to their uncultured neighbors. Count Piermont sees how this may be done: "People de fashion in both countries vil ve ver soon les

1. "Bon Ton," - Garrick, I, i, 1775.
2. "Side-Lights on the Georgian Period," - George Paston, (a book in the British Museum.)

mêmes; at present, voilà de difference: un Anglais est trop brusque, too rough; un Français, puet-être trop poli; but dat de faults sur cotê-droit, on de right side. Jack Bull is von guinea too heavy; et un Français, entre nous, peut-être, un Louis - d'or too light; now to make a de balance even, scrape de English, or vat you call sweat a de English guinea, et augmentez le Louis d'or, and you give polish to de one and the proper weight to the other."[1]

This aping of the French was, no doubt, quite a local matter, restricted almost entirely to London, and perhaps largely to court circles. Whatever the restriction, however, the eighteenth century in England was an age of high society; it was based on the French. It produced a literature of manners, and a comedy in taste and keeping - a comedy of artificial and external display, and a comedy whose dramatis personae crystalized in types. To this society the display of dress was of paramount importance, even as comedy of the time represents it and this love of display began with the Restoration. In this age, and in these brilliant circles, gentlemen with assumed airs of fine taste lamented like the cavaliers of Grammont in not receiving in suitable time for the court ball, the fine dress that came from France. Periwigs, cravats, hats, feathers, snuff-boxes, cosmetics - anything that reflected his person in the mirror to his own satisfaction - these occupied the courtier's time.[2] Dress and pleasure were the only objects fit for the "soul of a fine gentleman," said

1. "He Would be a Soldier," - Frederick Pilon, III, i, 1788.
2. "L'Influence Française en Angleterre au XVII, e Siècle," Charlanne, Pt. II, Chap. IX.

Colonel Feignwell, in A Bold Stroke for a Wife.[1] Moreover, for these young blades of the ward-robe there was no such word as utility in the dictionary of life. Let them have the buckles on their shoes as large as they choose. Formerly, indeed, buckles were a "sort of machine" intended to keep on the shoe; but the case is "now quite reversed, and the shoe is of no earthly use but to keep on the buckle,"[2] according to Lord Fashion. To the end of the eighteenth century, the arrival of every new fop from Paris set the stage and town in a flutter. As Lord Doricourt arrives, his liveries, his dress, his carriage, are all the rage of the day. His valet is besieged by levees of tailors, habit makers, and other devotees of fashion. "To gratify the impatience of their customers for becoming à-la-mode de Doricourt;"[3] and the beautiful Lady Frolic with two sister countesses begs the loan of his waistcoat for muffs, that her "snowy arms" may bear it in triumph about town, "to the heart-rending affliction of all our beau garçon." For a hundred years, the model of this court of punctilio was Sir Fopling Flutter, whose hands were "eminent for being bien-ganté," whose suit was du Barroy, garniture Le Gras, shoes Bicat, periwig Chedreux, gloves Orangerie; and whose coat was long cut, that it might make him show long-waisted and slender, for "that's the shape our ladies dote on."[4]

1. "Mrs. Centlivre," II, i, 1718.
2. "A Trip to Scarborough," - Sheridan, I,i, 1777.
3. "The Belle's Stratagem," - Mrs. Cowley, I,i, 1781.
4. "The Man of Mode," - Etherege, III, ii, 1676.

With the importation of French dress came the French speech. Everybody of the choice circles in town and theatre was tripping over French words and phrases. Charlanne notes that at the theatre English conversation was profusely sprinkled with French. In The Gentleman Dancing Master, Monsieur de Paris speaks French during nearly an entire scene.[1] When Sir Fopling talks of coming in a "calèche," and of London society as being "grossier," Lady Townley exclaims, "He's very fine!"[2] In The Relapse the fop used to appear more "dégagé;" a person of worse "taille" than his could not be a man of quality; and he deserves to be "mis en chartre."[3] In Love Makes the Man, we find young Sancho speaking "French like a magpipe."[4] Furthermore, when the fop is not sputtering French, he is affecting some other peculiarity of speech. Lord Foppington, for instance, changes his o's to a's. "Naw is it nat passible far me to penetrate what species of fally it is thau art driving at!"[5] he tells another character.

Flattery and vanity are necessary results of a life so unreal and affected as that of the fop; and in the realm of flattery, the French fop on the English stage was a pastmaster. To suggest that one had the air of Paris was a great compliment. So Sir Fopling begs to embrace Dorimant, since he had not met with any acquaintance who retained so much of Paris as he. To Sir Fopling a discourtesy might be atoned for by such an outburst as: "Ah, madam, pardon,

1. Wycherley, I, ii, 1672.
2. "The Man of Mode," - Etherege, III, ii, 1676.
3. Vanbrugh, IV, vi, 1697.
4. Colley Cibber, II, i, 1701.
5. "The Relapse," Vanbrugh, V, v.

the éclat of so much beauty, I confess, ought to have charmed me sooner."[1] In The Provok'd Wife, a French maid expresses herself in the same unrestrained fashion:

> Madam - "Every ting look ugly, Matam, dat stand by your ladyship."
> Lady Fanciful - "Me think you look mighty pretty."
> Madam - "Ah, Matam, de moon have not éclat ven de sun appear."[2]

In The Relapse Young Fashion must not ask his older brother for money in plain terms; such a manner would offend. He should flatter his brother into liberality: praise his periwig, his cravat, his feather, his snuff-box; then "desire a loan of £1000."[3] Mrs. Centlivre presents a good incident of the fop's use of flattery:

> La Feignwell - "My name is La Feignwell, sir...."
> Sir Phillip - "The La Feignwells are French..... I was sure you was French the moment I laid eyes on you. I could not come into the supposition of your being English: This island produces no such ornaments."[4]

Extravagance of compliment gushes forth spontaneously. "You fix me yours to the last existence of my soul's entity;" or, "your face pe handsomer den all de looking-glass in tee world;" or again, "your eyes set de fire in de house" - such expressions appear to be merely passing compliments. Doricourt cries: "By heavens! I never was so charmed till now - English beauty, French vivacity, wit, elegance!" These effusions, however do not seem to have been taken seriously in the French circle and the fop world; they were only a casual way of paying respect. At any rate, Sir Fopling tells

1. "The Man of Mode," III, ii, 1676.
2. Vanbrugh, I, ii, 1797.
3. Vanbrugh, I, ii, 1797.
4. "A Bold Stroke for a Wife," - Centlivre, I, ii, 1718.

us that in Paris it is the "mode to flatter the prude, make serious love to the demi-prude, and only rally the coquette."[1] And yet, the affection was carried so far that courtiers were taught how they should draw up their breast, stretch up the neck, play with the head, toss up the nose, bite the lips, turn up the eyes, and speak French words with a soft tone.

That the fop was vain goes without saying. His dress, the superfluity of frills and accessories used to adorn his person, the cosmetics used to make him sweet-scented, show how much he thought of his person. His personal appearance occupied his time for the most part. His clothes, and especially his gloves, must always be fragrant. Sir Fopling was "almost poisoned" by the odor of a pair of Cordovan gloves he saw at the theatre - he did not chance to like the quality. Monsieur holds that sweet aroma is necessary to the presence of a gentleman: "me come to provide de essence for his hair, dat he may approach to your varshipe vid de reverence and de belle air."[2] The fop's face and hands received as much attention ashis dress. Each week he received a new supply of perfumed gloves, pocket-mirrors, apricot paste, aromatic oils, and other special commodities from Paris. La Nippe declares that the current utensil of a fine gentleman is a "toillette à la chasse of cold cream, rouge, court plaster, lip salve, eau de lac, macassar oil, attar of roses."[3]

How these coxcombs had time for anything else than

1. "The Man of Mode," - Etherege, IV, i, 1676.
2. "Love Makes a Man," - Cibber, I, i, 1701.
3. "Lord of the Manor," - John Burgoyne, I, i, 1781.

dress and attention to person is hard to understand, when we learn that one dandy spent an hour a day on his teeth alone.[1] The exaggerated stress placed on outward adornment is everywhere present. "In my opinion," says Olivia in The Mulberry Garden, a half score of young men and fine ladies well drest, are a greater ornament to a garden, than a wilderness of sycamores, orange, and lemon trees; and the rustling of rich vests and silk petty-coats, better music than the purling of streams, chirping of birds, or any of our country entertainment."[2] All sorts of artificial means were accordingly used by these man-milliners to win the approval of the beau monde. They padded their limbs with yards of flannel to give them graceful curves; they wore silk stockings and dancing pumps while on horseback, to show a slender ankle; they wore gauntlets with large tassels to draw attention to their hands. If in addition they could pass for Frenchmen, their cup of vanity was full to the brim. "One little French footman have more honeur, more good blood in his veins, and much more good manners an' civility den all de English State General to-gether "thought" Monsieur.[3]

The fop was as vain of his so-called accomplishments as he was of his appearance. In his own estimation he was sometimes a poet, a musician, a painter, always a wit, and even a philosopher. The young blood of Parnassus, Ninny, insists on the repetition of his own verse. "Hold! hold!

1. "The Relapse," II, i, 1696.
2. Charles Sedley, I, iii, 1668.
3. "The Gentleman Dancing Master," - Wycherley, I, ii, 1673.

hear the rest," he cries, and reads:-

> "At once my hopes you nourish and destroy,
> My only grief, and yet my only joy."[1]

"Mark that! he cries in ecstasy. But he has pursued poor Stanford so relentlessly and read to him so long, that his victim snarls in despair: "O devil! Oh! how these curs bait me!" Another fop in the same play, Sir Positive, declares that he is either the greatest painter or greatest fop in nature. "Why," he says, "I will paint with Lilly, and draw in little with Cooper for £5000." The conceit of Sir Positive is over-weening. His accomplishments are legion - Navigation, geography, astronomy, palmistry, physic, divinity, etc.....; he can fence, dance, sing, speak French, command an army; he plays the violin, organ, harp, haut-but; he speaks Spanish, Italian, Greek, Hebrew, Dutch, Welsh, Irish; he is a sportsman; and of course, he is a poet. Sir Fopling often composed lines to wine, or to his lady:-

> "Wine and beauty by turns great souls should inspire:
> Present all together - and now, boys, give fire."[2]

And Doricourt sang:-

> "Give me a woman, in whose touching mien
> A mind, a soul, a polish'd art is seen."[3]

These accomplishments are, of course, treated as a travesty. The purpose of play-wrights was, no doubt, to satirize the whole foppish trend of the time.

The fop is, however, sometimes a waggish philosopher. "Monsieur" always makes jests of his quarrels: as for the

1. "The Sullen Lovers," - Shadwell, I,i, 1668.
2. "Man of Mode," IV, i, 1776.
3. "The Belle's Stratagem," - Mrs. Cowley,III, i, 1780.

English, for want of wit, they drive everything to a serious quarrel; then try to make a jest of it when it is too late. "Auh," he exclaims, "to be de buffoon is to be de great personage."[1] Sir Fopling finds that the wisest thing a man can do with an aching heart is to put on a serene countenance, and act like a great man; and in the case of weighty matters of state, he will leave them to weighty heads; he never intends that his head "shall be a burden" to his body. Similarly, Sir Novelty Fashion refuses to think at all, because thinking is to him "the greatest fatigue in the world;" Whereas Cignon, though always poor, laughs at his grievances and takes snuff.[2]

Finally, the fop is an accomplished sentimentalist. He loves; he embraces; he kisses. Nor is he always discriminating in the objects of his adoration; he by no means limits them to the fair sex. "Ah, my dear Jack Stanford I'm the happiest man on earth, prythee kiss me again,"[3] sighs Woodcock. He says that he would rather kiss Jack than a woman. Beau Banter, just returned from Oxford University, meets his brother, Sir Harry, who accosts him with, "By Jupiter! Ay he kisses like one of the family, the right velvet lip."[4] Clodio tells how, at the end of a banquet, men, wives, and sisters, kissed all round, drank healths, broke glasses, and parted.[5] These young exquisites pledged fidelity upon the snuff-box. They received challenges to fight duels every morning over their chocolate, because of

1. "The Gentleman Dancing Master," - Wycherley, I, ii, 1673.
2. "The Heiress," - Burgoyne, IV, i, 1786.
3. "The Sullen Lovers," - Shadwell, I, i, 1668.
4. "Sir Harry Wildair," - Farquhar, III, ii, 1701.
5. "Love Makes a Man," - Cibber, I, i, 1701.

their amorous intrigues the evening before. They are of the same pattern whether we find them in Cibber and Garrick of the eighteenth century, or in Etherege and Shadwell of the seventeenth; whether they are La Nippe, Sir Feignwell, and Lord Doricourt of 1775, or Sir Fopling, "Monsieur," and Ninny of 1675, they fill their time with amours, wooings, liasions. The fop must dance well, dress well, fence well; he must have an agreeable voice for a chamber; he must have a genius for love-letters; he must be sometimes discreet, not over constant, but always very amorous. Dryden sums up the qualities of the fop in an Epilogue to Etherege's Man of Mode:-

> "Sir Fopling is a fool so nicely writ,
> The ladies would mistake him for a wit.
> And when he sings, talks loud, would say,
> I vow, me thinks, he's pretty company!
> So brisk, so gay, so travell'd, so refined,
> As he took pains to graft upon his kind.
> True fops help nature's work, and go to school
> To file and finish God Almighty's fool."

A Survey of the Most Important Fop Plays.

The two most famous French fops in English comedy during the period under discussion are Sir Fopling Flutter in Etherege's The Man of Mode, 1676; and Lord Foppington in Vanbrugh's The Relapse, 1697. Gosse called Sir Fopling "the monarch of all beaux and dandies, the froth of Parisian affectation - a delightful personage almost as alive to us today as to the enchanted audience of 1676."[1] To the London society of the period, The Man of Mode was, perhaps, the most popular play of the time. Interest in the plot is aroused early through the announcement by an orange woman to Dorimant, - who is called the "only completely fine gentleman ever yet brought on the English stage,"[2]- of the arrival in town of the famous Lady Woodvil and her daughter Harriet. Immediately there is a flutter of excitement and expectancy. Suspence is initiated here, but interest is held by witty combats between some of the lower characters - a shoemaker, a footman, a valet, and others. Now begins a conversation between the elegant Dorimant and his friends Medley and Bellair on the subject of dress; this leads up to the introduction of Sir Fopling.[3]

> Medley - "There is a great critic, I hear, in these matters lately arrived piping hot from Paris."
> Bellair - "Sir Fopling Flutter, you mean."
> Medley - "He was yesterday at the play, with a pair of gloves up to his elbows and a periwig more exactly curled than a lady's head newly dressed for a ball."
> Bellair - "What a pretty lisp he has."
> Dorimant - "Ho! that he affects in imitation of the people of quality in France."

1. "Seventeenth Century Studies," p. 250, 1891.
2. Act I, sc. i.
3. Ibid.

Medley - "His head stands for the most part on one side, and his looks are more languishing than a lady's when she lolls at stretch in her coach or leans her head carelessly against the side of a box i' the playhouse."

Dorimant - "He is a person indeed of great acquired follies."

Medley then comments on the coxcomb's education, and the lack of wisdom of parents whose indulgence would produce such an absurd character. Bellair makes some observations on Sir Fopling's associating with the ladies, then gives Sir Fopling's catalogue of what makes a complete gentleman.

Act II, opens with a rather long-drawn-out quarrel among several characters, who are charging one another with faithlessness in love. Mrs. Loveit accuses Dorimant of neglecting her; and Dorimant replies that she is receiving attentions from "the very cockfool of all those fools, Sir Fopling Flutter." He ends his dialogue by showing how he never could love a woman who "can dote on a senseless caper, a tawdry French ribbon, a formal cravat."

Two acts have passed, in which Sir Fopling, the hero, has twice been the subject of discussion; but he has not yet made his appearance. In the third act, after we have been raised to a high pitch of interest and expectation, when we are all eager to catch a glimpse of this strange object of elegance, in his "periwig more exactly curled than a lady's head newly dressed for a ball," this fool "so brisk, so gay, so travell'd, so refined," this wit whose singing, loud talking, cocking, have given him the name of "God Almighty's fool," Sir Fopling is announced by a Page. Enter Sir Fopling Flutter with his Page after him.[1]

1. Act III, sc. ii.

> Sir Fopling - "Page, wait without. (To Lady Townley.) Madam, I kiss your hands. I see yesterday was nothing of chance; the belles assemblées form themselves here every day. Lady,(to Emilia,) your servant. Dorimant, let me embrace thee; without lying, I have not met with any of my acquaintance who retain so much of Paris as thou dost - the very air thou hadst when the Marquis mistook thee i' th' Tuileries, and cried, Ho! Chevalier! and then begged thy pardon."

In the brief dialogue between Sir Fopling and Dorimant, Sir Fopling begs that they may become more intimate with one another, and Dorimant protests his incapacity for becoming a confidant.

> Dorimant - "Why, first, I could never keep a secret in my life, and then there is no charm so infallibly makes me fall in love with a woman as my knowing a friend loves her.".....
> Sir Fopling - "Thy humour's very gallant, or let me perish; I knew a French count so like thee."

Lady Townley here reminds Sir Fopling that he has been neglecting Emilia all this while; so he turns to the lady with profound apology, - "The éclat of so much beauty, I confess, ought to have charmed me sooner." The conversation now turns on Emilia's clothes: he admires her "point d' Espagne." Suddenly he finds he has overlooked Medley; so he pours forth apologies with "in this embarrass of civilities I could not come to have you in my arms sooner." Now the conversation runs to poets, whom Sir Fopling damns because they claim a monopoly on wit; then, to his new calèche, which seems to have the "bel-air" as well as its owner. Finally they arrive at the subject of Sir Fopling's dress and appearance.

> Lady Townley - "He's very fine."
> Emilia - "Extremely proper."
> Sir Fopling - "A slight suit I made to appear in at my first arrival, not worthy your consideration, ladies."

Dorimant - "The pantaloon is very well mounted."
Sir Fopling - "The tassels are new and pretty."
Medley - "I never saw a coat better cut."
Sir Fopling - "It makes me show long-waisted, and, I think, slender."
Dorimant - "That's the shape our ladies dote on. Sir Fopling's 'breech' is not quite perfect, but they pass that to things more important."
Lady Townley - "His gloves are well fringed, large and graceful."
Sir Fopling - "I was always eminent for being bien-ganté."
Emilia - "He wears nothing but what are originals of the most famous hands in Paris."
Sir Fopling - "You are in the right, madam."
Lady Townley - "The suit?"
Sir Fopling - "Barroy."
Emilia - "The garniture?"
Sir Fopling - "Le Gras."
Medley - "The shoes?"
Sir Fopling - "Picat ."
Dorimant - "The periwig?"
Sir Fopling - "Chedreux."
Lady Townley and Emilia - "The gloves?"
Sir Fopling - "Orangerie: you know the smell, ladies."

They all engage to go to St. James's for the evening.

Sir Fopling - "All the will be at the Park tonight, ladies, 'twere pity to keep so much beauty longer within doors and rob the Ring of all those charms that should adorn it. - Hey, pages! See that all my people be ready. Dorimant, au revoir!"

Now that the fop has gone out, we shall hear what the rest think of him.

Medley - "A fine mettled coxcomb."
Dorimant - "Brisk and insipid."
Medley - "Pert and dull."
Emilia - "However you despise him, gentlemen, I'll lay my life he passes for a wit with many."

The play continues in a series of rapidly changing love incidents and situations. Suddenly we see Sir Fopling with his equipage pass over the stage.

Sir Fopling - "Hey Campagne, Norman, La Rose, La Fleur, La Tour, La Verdue. Dorimant!

He has arrived at St. James's where he meets Mrs. Loveit.

Sir Fopling - "Madam, the honor of kissing your hands is a happiness I missed this afternoon at my Lady Townley's."
Loveit - "You were very obliging, Sir Fopling, the last time I saw you there."
Sir Fopling - "The preference was due to your wit and beauty. Madam, your servant; there never was so sweet an evening."

In spite of the "sweet" evening, Sir Fopling is disappointed because "there's not an order made that none but the beau monde should walk here."

When next we meet Sir Fopling, it is at a masked ball. He does not seem to have the good will of the other male characters. Young Bellair asks who the masqueraders are; to this Medley replies that they are"a company of French rascals whom he picked up in Paris and has brought over to be his dancing equipage on these occasions." Sir Fopling is one of the masqueraders. His part in the play now ends.

In this play we find the influence of Molière strongly marked. Sir Fopling Flutter is patterned after Mascarille of Les Précieuses Ridicules. Each dandy is boastful of his social connections; each has attained to certain literary excellence. Mascarille boasts of his "wonderful hand at impromptus;" Sir Fopling has similar power in writing songs and ballets. Mascarille would sing his compositions for Madelon, had not the "brutality of the season" injured the delicacy of his voice; Sir Fopling learned to sing in Paris under the royal master, Lambert, the greatest in the world, but sitting up late and drinking have made his voice unfit. Both are in the habit of singing only in a ruelle. Sir Fopling's other

attainments have counterparts in Mascarille: he prefers dancing to anything else, but, in this instance he will have his troupe dance; Mascarille finds his heart willing to dance, but the musicians are unable to play for him. Each exhibits himself and his clothes before a group of admirers, and gets their opinion on the details of his dress. Each is accounted a wit, and boasts being one. Each is a great flatterer, and a great ladies man. Each swaggers and rails at his numerous troupe of lackeys as they enter, and calls them by name. Each is announced early in the play, and is so described by some other character as to arouse our curiosity; and each comes in rather late in the progress of the play. Finally, each leaves the stage defeated and discredited at the end. In The Man of Mode, then, we discover to what degree Etherege copied Molière's method of using delicate ridicule for things unreasonable. Gosse tells us that Etherege loitered in Paris long enough for Molière to be revealed to him; then hastened back to England with a totally new idea of writing a comedy.[1]

Lord Foppington is the second of the famous fops in English comedy. He is Vanbrugh's continuation of Cibber's "Sir Novelty Fashion" in Love's Last Shift. Lord Foppington is, on the whole, rather superior to Sir Fopling. He has the affectation, the glitter and tinsel of Etherege's coxcomb; but hepossesses genuine wit, mental acumen, and is more the fop by caprice. Professor A. W. Ward calls him "one of the most inimically drawn characters within the range of English comic drama."[2] In the Prologue to The Relapse, spoken by

1. "Seventeenth Century Studies," p. 239, 1891.
2. Introduction to Sir John Vanbrugh's Works.

Mrs. Verbruggen, and affixed to the 1697 edition, we find the qualities common to all fops, but meant especially as a description of Lord Foppington:

> "They'll shew you twenty thousand airs and graces,
> "They'll entertain you with their soft grimaces ,
> Their snuff-box, awkward bows - and ugly faces."

In The Relapse, Lord Foppington is introduced by other characters, much as was Sir Fopling, through a description of some of his traits and affectations, though Foppington enters much earlier in the play.[1] "Young Fashion," brother of Lord Foppington - also called Sir Novelty Fashion - complains of being inadequately supplied with money by his older brother. To arouse Foppington to greater liberality, Lory, a servant to Young Fashion, suggests that his master use flattery:

> "Say nothing to him, apply yourself to his favourites; speak to his periwig, his cravat, his feather, his snuff-box, and when you are well with them - desire him to lend you a thousand pounds."

The scene changes, and Lord Foppington appears. His first words are a rebuke to his Page for addressing him as "Sir" instead of as "My Lord." Alone, he soliloquizes: "Well, 'tis an unspeakable pleasure to be a man of quality - strike me dumb - My Lord - your Lordship - My Lord Foppington - Ah! c'est quelque chose de beau, que le Diable m'emporte." La Verole, his valet de chambre, enters and announces, "de shoemaker, de taylor, de hosier, de sempstress, de peru, be all ready, if your lordship please to dress." Lord Foppington now surveys himself while he is being dressed, much as did

1. Act I, sc. ii.

Sir Fopling in The Man of Mode. Each part of his accoutrement is tried, studied, passed on.

When he appears next, he is announced to Berinthia, a young widow, as " my Lord Foppington" who has "bought a barony, in order to marry a great fortune."[1] Loveless, who is present, thinks the title may have improved the coxcomb. To Amanda, wife of Loveless, he addresses himself on entering: "The beautifullest race of people upon earth, rat me." "Dear Loveless," he continues, "I am overjoyed to see you have brought your family to tawn again: I am, stap my vitals." His lordship finds "thinking very fatigueing;" but he has a private gallery, furnished with books and looking-glasses where he walks sometimes; for he finds it entertaining "to walk and look upon 'em." His habits are much like Sir Fopling's. He rises at ten, - not sooner because it is "the worst thing in the world for the complexion." If the day is good, he goes to the park "to see the fine women." Then he has dinner at Lacket's, where he spends the time, before going to the play-house, "between eating my dinner and washing my mouth." At the theatre he entertains himself "with looking upon the company." All these diversions occupy twelve hours. During the other twelve he spends four in toasting himself drunk, and the other eight in sleeping himself sober. This he calls "an eternal round of delights." As to his intrigues, he usually makes "detachments of it" from his other pleasures. Weightier affairs he leaves to

1. Act II, sc. i.

"weighty heads;" he does not intend his shall be a burden to his body. He goes to church Sundays to be entertained; there he ogles "my Lady Tattle, my Lady Prate, my Lady Titter, my Lady Leer, my Lady Giggle, and my Lady Grin." He makes love to Amanda, wife of Loveless, almost at sight, squeezes her hand, and begins, "I am in love with you to desperation."

In Act III, we find that Sir Novelty has not yet paid Young Fashion the money asked, for "taxes are so great, repairs so exorbitant , tenants such rogues, and periwigs so dear," that he has been "forc'd to retrench in that one article of sweet pawder," even. He will not, however quarrel with the brother, but "with the temper of a philosopher, and the discretion of a statesman," he will go to the play.

The next time Lord Foppington appears he is in the hands of Sir Tunbelly Clumsey, a country gentleman and magistrate, who threatens to beat his teeth down his throat. Lord Foppington asks, "why would'st thou spoil my face at that rate?" The old gentleman accuses him of stealing his daughter, and demands that he marry the girl at once. When the fop consents with rather unexpected alacrity, Sir Tunbelly calls him mad, has him bound with a rope, and orders him put into a dark room on bread and water. The daughter in question, Miss Hoyden, enters and exclaims: "Is that he that wou'd have run away with me? Fough, how he stinks of sweets! Pray, father, let him be dragg'd through the horse pond." The constable suggests putting "my Lord" into the dog kennel; but Foppington begs to be put into a clean room,

"that I mayn't daub my clothes," he says. He is rescued at the critical moment by Sir John Friendly, who explains the identity of Lord Foppington; this satisfies Sir Tunbelly, who offers his daughter now to "my Lord." The wedding is arranged, and festivities are begun, when Young Fashion, Sir Tunbelly's chaplain, and Hoyden herself appear to announce that Young Fashion and Hoyden have just been married. The resulting scene is amusing. In his final speech Lord Foppington resigns himself to his ill fortune: -

> (Lord Foppington, aside). - "Naw, for my part, I think the wisest thing a man can do with an aking heart, is to put on a serene countenance; for a philosophical air is the most becoming thingin the warld to the face of a person of quality; I will therefore bear my disgrace like a great man and let people see I am above an affront. (To Young Fashion.) Dear Tam, since things are thus fallen out, pr'ythee give me leave to wish thee jay. I do it bon coeur, strike me dumb. You have married a woman beautiful in her person, charming in her airs, prudent in her canduct, canstant in her inclinations, and of a nice marality, split my windpipe."

Lord Foppington, one of the most appealing characters in drama, is none the less a strange contradiction of the fantastical and the sane; of the strangely absurd, and the unexpectedly rational. His title of Lord is an open sesame to all to which he would aspire; it is a passport to every woman's heart; it wins him the support of the wealthy Sir Tunbelly; it gets him a seat in parliament. When his silly ambitions get him into awkward embarrassments, he puts on a "serene countenance," and assumes a "philosophical air." Such resignation, and such calm decision are indicative of a mind superior to that of a coxcomb in general, and judging

THR

from Lord Foppington's earlier actions, unexpected in him. The imperturbable sang-froid with which he resigns himself to unpleasant circumstances is notable. He refused to help his brother, most cruelly and selfishly; then, when he is bound and imprisoned by the constable, he calmly admits the injustice of his action and offers to pay him ten fold. He opposed most vigorously the claim of Young Fashion to the hand of Miss Hoyden; but, convinced that he has really lost her, together with the wealth she would have brought him, he does not rail or abuse any person in the plot against him; he shows no sign of resentment, but graciously resigns her with a speech in eulogy of the young woman's charming personality and excellent character. The speech he makes at this time is really superior to what we should expect of a fop.

Before the opening of the eighteenth century there were several other plays that treated fop characters - Wycherley's The Gentleman Dancing Master, Shadwell's Bury Fair, and Crowne's Sir Courtly Nice. In The Gentleman Dancing Master the fop assumes the role merely in the early part of the play; for, later, when it is to his interest to do so, he suddenly turns Spanish soldier, speaks good English, and loses most of his French affectations. This fop is "Monsieur de Paris," newly returned from Paris, and mightily affected in French speech and fashions. He enters early, crying, "Serviteur! serviteur! la cousine; I come to give the bon soir as the French say." His greatest affectation is in his speech, for we see less of assumed gentility, gallantry, and

graciousness in him than in Sir Fopling or Lord Foppington. This may, however, be partly due to the fact that his conversation is almost wholly with men characters. This fop will not speak of Mr. Taylor or Mr. Smith in those terms, but must Frenchify the names, Monsieur Taileur, Monsieur Esmit, even though he is not understood. He asks Mrs. Flirt, "Doo you tinke so then, sweet madam, I have mush of de French eyre?"[1] Monsieur takes a dislike to Monsieur Gerard's pretenses: "Oh he is a pretty kind of a man, for an Englishman," but he is no real French gentleman: to begin with, "his valet de chambre is no Frenchman, and he himself has been seen at noon-day to go into an English eating-house." Besides, he lacks those qualities so essential to a French gentleman, - ability to dance, to sing a French song, swear a French oath, use polite French words, play hombre, and carry a snuff-box. Besides, his tailor is not French. Monsieur wears the "belte," the sword, the peruke, the "chapeau retroussé" as the dandy should; he enjoys his rallies of wit; he has his "petites affaires du coeur." In these respects he is a worthy forerunner of Sir Fopling and Lord Foppington.

In another play of Wycherley, The Plain Dealer, there is given a railing coxcomb, an admirer of novelties,[2] called Novel. There are not, however, many qualities of the fop evident in Novel's speeches and actions, though he holds that "a man by his dress as much as by anything, shows his wit and judgement."[3] This play also has Lord Plausible, who apes a

1. Act I, sc.ii.
2. ActII, sc.i.
3. Ibid.

fashionable impudence, a fanciful dress, a scented glove, a languishing tone, flattery, and "slavish obsequiousness" in his attentions. Another character, Old Major Old-Fox, too, has a bit of swaggering foppishness about him, but it does not stand out strongly enough to characterize him as belonging to the type.

Shadwell wrote one comedy before Wycherley's The Gentleman Dancing Master, namely The Sullen Lovers, 1668. Shadwell's fops, however, are not French, nor do they have a large share in his plays. They have certain traits found in the French fops, but they make no reference to having been in France. Woodcock, with his soft, gushing affection for his men friends, his "kiss me again dear Heart," his "dear Rogue," "dear Bully-Rock," "dear Jock," "O dear Rascal, kiss me,"[1] and Ninny, the conceited poet, with his silly, fantastical sing-song verses which he compels all to listen to, and his own conceited comments on his lines, foreshadows the coming of Sir Fopling and others. The range of their foppish attainments is narrow; there is nothing humorous, nothing interesting about them. Brisk in Shadwell's The Humorist, also has fop qualities.[2] The ladies are all in love with him; they leave their "Tour" and come about him. He says, "You must know, I do value myself upon my clothes and the judicious wearing of 'em." In Shadwell's Bury Fair,[3] 1689, La Roche, a peruke maker, is induced by several wild young Englishmen to act the

1. Act I, sc. i.
2. Act III, sc. i, 1671.
3. Act I.

part of a French count, and to make love to Mrs. Fantast. Mrs. Fantast is flattered with "his gallantry" and her mother has often "bewail'd the not having the honour to be born French." But surely the Fantasts got French culture somewhere, for the Count is amazed at their French accomplishments: "The French Looke, French Ayre, French Mein, French Movement of de Bodee!" He will bet five hundred pistole the ladies were bred in France.

Shadwell's Bury Fair was first acted in 1689; it follows Etherege's The Man of Mode by more than a decade, and therefore, may have been influenced by it. In it a wag, Wildish, tells a French barber: "I must have you a French count, pass'd upon the choicest Sparks, and best-bred Men and Ladies. I will have this Fellow pass upon the Fops of Bury."[1] So La Roche, the barber, assumes the qualities of a French fop; he loves dress, is voluble, boastful, amorous, and gallant. Being on masquerade merely, he lacks much of the conceit, affectation, and sentimentality found in the usual fop of his time; he does not speak of his own appearance, of his accomplishments in singing, dancing, and fencing. He does not boast of his many love conquests; in fact, he is interested in but one woman, and actually wishes to marry her. Besides, his vocation has bred in him a briskness and business-like manner not in keeping with the languor of the Sir Foplings and Lord Foppingtons.

Mr. Trim in the same play is, however, a more "complete

1. Act I, sc. ii.

and finished fop" than La Roche. He is "all ceremony and no sense," languid, affected, fantastical, with his "sweet Mr. Wildish" and his kissing of hands. When asked by Wildish to sup with him, he says that he never sups, but he does indeed "divert himself with some milk-pottage in the evening." Sir Humphry wishes to be more familiar with him, - "Familiar!" he cries, "I must tell you, Sir, I cannot brook the Roughness of your Demeanor; the Consequences whereof may produce those Effects, as may not be agreeable to those Decencies requir'd in Conversation:" So he takes his leave to "visit the Ladies." He tells us he is for the Ladies, to whom he has ever sacrific'd his devoir. He constantly speaks of his breeding, his honor, and the decencies that become gentlemen. His soft, insinuating blandishments are quite in keeping with the real fop type.

The Volunteers of Shadwell, 1693, is the last play in which he treats the fop character. There are two fop characters in the play, Sir Nicholas Dainty, and Sir Timothy Kastril. Sir Timothy is a sort of satellite of Sir Nicholas, whose chief characteristics are writing billet-doux and fearing war. Sir Nicholas Dainty is what his name implies - conceited, fantastical, affected, most luxurious, and effeminate. A statement made early in the play by a female character, Teresia, shows the probable influence of Etherege's Man of Mode: "She knows nothing of the Beau Mond, as Sir Fopling says." Sir Nicholas is described by Teresia as the "finest gentleman in England; the most curious Dress, the

finest Air, and the gallantest Mien... that delicate perfect, most accomplished sweet Sir Nicholas."[1] He loves to fight, so he must have a fine fighting-suit: "It is Scarlet, slightly flourished with Silver; a bloody Cravat; and the neatest, best-stitch'd, beau gloves; the finest light Periwig; and the prettiest Shoes in the World: And the Motto upon the Sword is Love and Honour; because gentlemen fight for nothing else."[2] Sir Nicholas is a great fighter. His war tent is to have fringes of embroidery - he corrects the statement; the fringe and embroidery are for the velvet bed and counterpane in his tent. The hangings of his tent are all oriental silk, and the outside is damask. On the campaign he plans to carry two butlers, his service of plate and table-linen, two cooks, a confectioner, a laundress, dairy maids, and all their utensils; for he must have cream, fresh butter, and "disart." Then he will take "twelve rich campaign suits, six dancing suits, and twelve pairs of dancing shoes." Besides, he must carry with him all sorts of fine wines, etc., etc. Sir Nicholas is also a great lady's man. The ladies do so persecute him: they flock about him, and so shower him with billet-doux, that he thinks of having a secretary; indeed, he has "fellows out of Livery, privately, for nothing but to carry Answers."[3] He has the most languishing ways of ogling the ladies, which he must rehearse before the mirror every day. He is always hurrying up and down to the Plays, the Park, and Music-Meeting and the like."[4] He is moreover,

1. Act I, sc. i.
2. act III, sc. i.
3. Act II, sc. i.
4. Act II, sc. i.

a practiced duelist, as the following shows: "when he came up first, he threw in a Pass or two, very briskly - 'Faith - But when he found how strongly I Parried, and how Lightning I flung my Passes in, hah, hah, - He soon retir'd."[1] Thus he describes one of his contests.

In Sir Courtly Nice, by John Crowne, 1685, we have the first real descendant of Sir Fopling Flutter, The Man of Mode but I treat him after Lord Foppington, since he's less important than Vanbrugh's fop. He is a genteel, dainty, courtly, fop. He is called "the general guitar o' the town. Inlay'd with everything women fancy; gaytry, gallantry, delicacy, nicety, courtesy.[2] We are told that he is unusually civil and respectful; that he is "so gentle a creature, he writes a challenge in the style of a billet-doux;" that he finds eternal happiness in his looking-glass. As in the case of Sir Fopling, he does not make his appearance until near the middle of the play.[3] We see him for the first time in his chamber dressing, and surrounded by men and women who sing to him. He tells his attendants that wherever he goes, "all the world cries that's a gentleman, my life on't a gentleman; and when y'ave said a gentleman, you have said all." He adds that fine teeth are necessary to a fine gentleman, but fine language belongs merely "to pedants and poor fellows that live by their wits." He regards men of quality above wit, and when he writes, he disregards wit; he writes "like a gentleman, soft and easy." He also turns his hand to writing drama, but only by way of

1. Act IV, sc. i.
2. Act II, sc. i.
3. Act III.

garniture, "as a song or a prologue." Sir Courtly is especially fastidious about his food. He will not eat salt handled by butlers and waiters in London; so he sends his own butler to his country home, forty miles away, for this condiment; nor will he drink wine,for he saw the "clowns press all the grapes with their filthy naked feet." He adds that it is "no wonder we are poison'd with their wine ... O the nasty dogs!"[1] The dialogue between Surly and Sir Courtly following this is very amusing. The fop bows and scrapes, speaks at length of his clothes, of love, of drink, kisses, etc., while Surly chafes, fumes, and raves in a medley of asides. This novel dialogue was perhaps influenced by Molière, in Les Fâcheux, Le Malade Imaginaire, or Les Précieuses Ridicules. Sir Courtly's speeches are very like Mascarille's in Les Précieuses Ridicules. The dialogue between Sir Courtly and Leonora is particularly so:

> Sir Courtly - "Now, madam is the glorious opportunity come which my soul has long wish'd to express how much I admire, adore -"
> Leonora - "Oh! Sir Courtly - "
> Sir Courtly - "Extravagantly adore!"
> Leonora - "Oh! Sir Courtly, I cannot receive all this."
> Sir Courtly - "Oh madam, is there anything on the earth so charming?...
> Leonora - "Fie, Sir Courtly!"
> Sir Courtly - "Never since I was born."
> Leonora - "You'll kill me with blushing."
> Sir Courtly - "I speak my soul, Heavens! what divine teeth there are."
> Leonora - "Fie! fie! I shall never open my mouth more."[2]

Thus the dialogue continues for four pages; and then, when Surly enters, it is resumed for several pages more. Sir Courtly's songs to Leonora in the last act are obviously

1. Act III, sc. i.
2. Act IV.

copied after Les Précieuses Ridicules, scene one; and his encounter with Leonora's aunt and governess, who mistakes his appeal for help to win Leonora as a proposal to herself, imitates a similar scene in Les Femmes Savantes [1] of Molière.

The beginning of change in the representation of the French fop is marked by George Farquhar. In Farquhar the Restoration comedy comes to a close. After Etherege's Sir Fopling, the treatment of the fop as an object of amusement pure and simple, gives place more and more to a treatment of him as an object of satire. The light, gay, witty, coquettish French dandy, the influence of Molière's graceful and impersonal characters, is passing. The fop, in later comedies, is an English product, in whom foppishness is largely a caprice of the moment, put on for the occasion; it does not sit so lightly and easily. Back of the veneer is the natural, wholesome, commonsense Englishman. We can easily account for Farquhar's different treatment of his character. Farquhar was born in Ireland; hence he was removed from the influence of Molière, which dominated the London stage. It was only near the end of the period that he came to London.

Farquhar's best known fop appears in two of his comedies, The Constant Couple, 1699, and its sequel, Sir Harry Wildair, 1701. This fop is Sir Harry Wildair. Like his forebears in the Restoration comedy, he comes newly from Paris, and is followed by his numerous troupe. He is described as a "Gentleman of most happy Circumstances, born to a beautiful Estate; he has had a genteel and easy Education, free from the Rigidness

1. Act I, sc. iv.

of Teachers, and Pedantry of Schools."[1] We are told that he has not met with misfortune, nor been deprived of pleasure, and that by his "Gaiety and Humour" he entertains his friends. He persecutes Lady Lurewell "with letters, songs, dances, serenading, flattery, foppery, and noise."[2] He speaks to her in French of the gallantries of the beau monde. He is however, a man of business; and when a scandal is raised against him later, he determines, like a simple home-spun Englishman, to beat the perpetrator with a good English cudgel, and not to challenge him to a beau's duel of bandied words or jeweled rapiers. Later, also, when Colonel Standard challenges him to fight in a quarrel over a woman, he argues well enough about the folly of fighting, and bids the Colonel take the woman.

As a man of principle, however, Sir Harry is still a product of the Restoration, with its immodesty, its scurrility, its sensuality. He is as unprincipled as the worst of them. Woman's virtue can be bought: the amount of the offer only is the question at issue. Glitter and tinsel count more with woman than do deeds of manliness. The method he suggests to Colonel Standard by which they may settle their dispute over Lady Lurewell shows the moral fibre of this new type of fop;-

> "Fight for a woman! Hard by is the Lady's House; if you please, we'll wait on her together: You shall draw your Sword, I'll draw my Snuff-Box. You shall produce your Wounds received in War; I'll relate mine by Cupid's Dart:- You shall look big; I'll ogle;- you shall swear; I'll sigh - you shall sa, sa, and I'll Coupee; and if she flies not to my Arms like a Hawk to Perch, my Dancing-Master deserves to be damn'd."[3]

1. Act I, sc. ii.
2. Act I, sc. ii.
3. "Constant Couple," IV, i.

He declares that all women are alike. He thinks honor very troublesome and impertinent. He would live together with Lord Bellamy "like good neighbors and Christians, as they do in France."[1] They would share coaches; they would dine and sup one another; they would exchange wives, for this is what men of quality do.

In the same play, Beau Banter, a younger brother of Sir Harry, is a fop of the same pattern. Each of his brothers seems to have been a University man, for Sir Harry speaks of his study of Latin and Greek, whereas Banter claims to have been at Oxford seven years. In spite of this experience he is a fop, for "Legs of mutton, small Beer, crabbed Books, and Sour-fac'd Doctors" to the contrary not withstanding, he "can dance a minuet, court a mistress, play at piquet, or make a Paroli, with any Wildair in Christendom."[2] His part in the play is small; but he is a good copy of the elder brother fops. Clincher and Monsieur Marquis in these two plays are also fops - airy, flippant, conceited, intriguing; but their parts are small.

Colley Cibber is the next play-wright to treat the French fop. His first important comedy, Love's Last Shift, first acted in 1696, presents in Sir Novelty Fashion a good replica of Sir Fopling Flutter. Long before Sir Novelty appears, he is heralded as a person seeking the praise of others, as being a slave to fashion, as ever "advancing some new Piece of Foppery," and as being extravagant in his attempt to gain public reputation. At the beginning of Act II, he

1. "Sir Harry Wildair," V, iv, 1701.
2. Act II, sc. i.

appears, pouring forth in a gushing way his praise of Narcissa, a lady of fortune: "Your Beauty, like the Wrack, forces every Beholder to confess his crime of daring to adore you." Now we hear her speak in flattering terms of his person; they discuss and pass judgement on the details of his clothes, much as was done in the case of Sir Fopling and of Vanbrugh's Lord Foppington. His business is love, he tells Narcissa; it was likewise love in case of most of the other fops. He has rivals whom, however, one of his ability will easily defeat; so had the other fops. His diversions were the park, the theatre, and masquerading, just as theirs had been; and, like them, when at the theatre, he saw nothing of the play, for he turned his back to the stage and watched the ladies. His method of wooing is interesting. He will gain "free access to Narcissa." What will follow? He gives the stages: "Opportunity, Importunity, Resistance, Force, Entreaty, Persisting - Doubting, Swearing, Lying-Blushes, Yielding, Victory, Pleasure, Indifference." According to Ward, Cibber's French fop in the above play is one of the best easy-going fools ever invented."[1] In wit he is superior to the others, and in intrigue less the roué. When asked what brought him to Windsor, he replied, "Two hours and six of the best Nags in Christendom." When Lord Morelove suggested that he"make haste," he says, "I always fly when I pursue." On being asked why he had married, he retorted, "to pay my debts at play, and disinherit my younger brother." This kind of wit requires more thinking than Vanbrugh's fop was to be capable of, or would care to exert; he was too

1. "English Dramatic Literature," A.W. Ward, Vol.III, p. 477.

languid to exercise his mind; thinking, he declared, was too heavy for his body to bear. Sir Fopling, however, excels Sir Novelty in personal display, and in the interest he created among his associates.

One more of Cibber's comedies contains the fop character, namely, Love Makes a Man, or The Fop's Fortune, 1701. We learn something of Clodio, the fop, early in the play, when Monsieur, Valet to Clodio, enumerates the preparation made by his master before appearing to pay his respects to Antonio:

> Monsieur. - "Sire, me come to provide de Pulvile, and de Essence for his Peruque, dat he may approoche to your Vorshipe vid de Reverence, and de belle Air."[1]

More of the manner of this fop comes to the surface in the valet's next speech: "he vas enrage, and did break his Bottle d'Orangerie, because it vas not de same dat is prepare for Monseigneur le Dauphin."[2] Clodio is a real product of Paris; for, not to live in France, he declares, is not to breathe at all. He prides himself in his clothes, wears most of them merely for ornament, and speaks of his tailors constantly. Besides, he wants his brother to dress "more en Cavalier," to take out his snuff-box, and to look smart. Like fops generally, he has his amorous intrigues: he has always found "that Love and Assurance ought to be as inseparable Companions as a Beau and a Snuff-box." His snuff-box he has constantly with him, and constantly on display; so, when later he loses it, he declares he dares not show his face in Paris without it. He sings; he drinks. He enters into all those pretty diversions common to his kind. His "chief

1. Act I, sc. i.
2. Ibid.

amusement has lain among Ladies." He has "far'd well in France." When a servant brings in his wine, he begins to sing:-

> "Allons! Baises Donc!
> Morbleu! ce n'est pas Mauvais!
> Allons encore bey! Vive
> L'Amour!"[1]

and kisses the young woman. He visits the theatre as a matter of course, but he has nothing to say of the play; it is only of the women present that he speaks. He knows the theatre, "the Side-box, Sir, and behind the Scenes; ay, and the Green-Room, and all the girls and Women-Actresses there." He attends the rehearsals, and desires the actresses to use his name whenever they please, "for what the Chocolate-house afforded." He is chosen Valentine "to about eleven of 'em; and "in three Days more," he thinks, it cost him "fifty Guineas in Gloves, Knots Heads, Fans, Muffs, Coffee, Tea, Snuff-boxes, Orangerie, and Chocolate."[2] Finally, when at the end of the play he is cleared of a charge of murder, he makes "bold to lead 'em up a Dance à la Mode de Angleterre."[3]

The next eighteenth century English comedy to treat the fop character is A Bold Stroke for a Wife, 1718, by Mrs. Centlivre. In this play there are two fop characters, namely, Sir Philip Modelove and Colonel Fainwell. Sir Philip wishes to pass for a French dandy; Fainwell assumes the dress and manner of a fop merely to carry out an intrigue. They both enter late, in the second act. Fainwell is followed by his French troupe whom he harangues just as did Sir Fopling and Lord Foppington. As Sir Philip cries to his retinue, "Hey! Pierre, Jacque, Renno? - Where are you all

1. Act IV, sc. iv.
2. Ibid.
3. Act V, sc. iii.

scoundrels?" Fainwell says: "Le Noir, la Blanc - Marbleu, où font ces Coquins la? Allons, Monsieur la Chevalier." Sir Philip calls Fainwell the best bred man in Europe. They produce their snuff-boxes, speak of their "prodigious fine" quality, and of the fact that they are French. Sir Philip inquires "what Country is so happy to claim the Birth of the finest Gentleman in the Universe," and suggests that it must be France, for surely "this Island could not produce a Person of such Alertness." When the Colonel holds a pocket-mirror up to Sir Philip's face, a woman observing them cries "coxcombs". Sir Philip is distinguished for his French gaiety and fine courtly figure; but he refuses a title since he abhors "the Fatigue which must have attended it." They discuss the subject of love; then they embrace one another, since their sentiments are so agreeable and in accord. Colonel Fainwell has such "vivacity and jautée Mein;" there are "few such ornaments" as he in England. To both there is nothing so agreeable as the Conversation of a fine Woman; both are fond of dancing and the masquerade. In this tenor their conversation continues. In them we have exemplified the qualities and attributes of the typical French fop - the dress, the vanity, the love of certain amusements, love making, affected speech, etc. Both characters assume different roles later; but in the early part of the play, they are genuine fops of the school of Etherege and Vanbrugh.

The influence of French foppery is present in several of Mrs. Centlivre's other comedies. In <u>The Beau's Duel</u>,

Plotwell's wife refuses to kiss him; so he plans to win her by dressing like a French macaroni. He bids a servant fetch him a French night-gown, a "French Head," and set his dressing - table in order with paint, powder, patches, etc. In the Epilogue to this play the author speaks of fops as "a Fickle, False, a Singing, Dancing Crew," and of how a Frenchman in a dressing-room taught a beau how to smile. In The Gamester, she presents Marquis who speaks French and acts affectedly. Likewise in The Gotham Election and The Marplot, there are evidences of French dandyism.

Now, for nearly forty years the fop seems to have disappeared from English comedy. When we next meet him on the stage, it is in The Englishman Returned from Paris, by Samuel Foote, 1756. In this play Buck, the returned coxcomb, has become so French that he refuses to write in English. Half of his speech is French. England has become for him a place "savage and barbare;" he cannot tolerate English fogs and boiled beef. "Paris is the place!" In Paris one learns how to eat, drink, dress, dance, sing, etc. To be a gentleman one needs "bon ton." Buck prides himself upon his literary attainments, the writing of French poetry and French tragedy. He is also accompanied by his troupe of servants as were the other fops, and requires three valets to dress him. In Foote's A Trip to Calais, 1778, the French Lapelle will qualify for macaroni. He is called "an audacious old fop" by Jenny to whom he proposes at first sight in the true coxcomb fashion. Tronifort in the play also has fop traits.

In George Colman's The Jealous Wife, 1761, Lord Trinket possesses many of the attributes of a fop. Likewise in Clandestine Marriage, by Garrick and Colman, 1766, there is a fop, Lord Ogleby. Colman Junior, son of George Colman, carried the fop character into the next century, in Who Wants a Guinea. In this play Solomon Gundy, a barber returned from Paris, shrugs, grimaces, sputters French polite phrases, and is dressed in "butterfly garments" and "powdered toupee."

Another important play of this time containing the coxcomb is Sheridan's A Trip to Scarborough, 1777. This play is, however, merely an adaptation of Vanbrugh's The Relapse. Sheridan presents Lord Foppington almost as he appeared in Vanbrugh's comedy - speech, dress, action. He has, however, expurgated some of Vanbrugh's indelicate dialogue, and has shortened the play.

In 1780 we get the last genuine French fop who dominates an English play. This dandy is Doricourt, in Mrs. Cowley's The Belle's Stratagem. Isaac Reed called this play "a paltry masquerade on the Prince of Wales."[1] At any rate, Mrs. Cowley must have gone direct to Lord Foppington for her model. Doricourt is lately arrived from Rome instead of from Paris; yet he has every earmark of the French fop. "His carriage, his liveries, his dress, himself, are all the rage of the day! His first appearance set the whole town in a ferment, and his valet is besieged by levées of tailors, habit-makers, and other ministers of fashion, to gratify the impatience of their customers, for becoming à la mode de Doricourt."[2] This tallies well with Lord

1. "Biographia Dramatica." Vol. IV, London, 1812.
2. Act I, sc. i.

Foppington and the excitement his coming caused. We are told further that the beautiful Lady Frolic and several others "begged Doricourt's waistcoat for muffs, and bore them triumphantly about town." His French porter exhibits the dandy's wardrobe, much as was done in the case of Lord Foppington." Velvets by Le Messe - suits cut Verdue - trimmings by Grossette - embroidery by Detanville."[1] Doricourt also has his French troupe of servants following him about as did Lord Foppington. We are told that statesmen, patriots, and heroes ape the "frippery of France;" that women must have the "air enjoué" of resistless French charmers.

Doricourt acts the part of a French coxcomb in all respects. He is extravagant in his flattery of women. At the approach of Letitia he cries out: "By heavens! I never was so charmed till now - English beauty - French vivacity - wit - elegance....!"[2] On the subject of feminine charm and beauty he speaks with the same effusion in other parts of the play. Accordingly, he becomes the cynosure of all ladies' eyes. "The women, I observe, always simper when you appear"[3] says Sir George Touchwood. Saville tells how the whole female world is in love with him. The lips of one tremble when he is spoken of; the bosom of another heaves a sigh; the third turns her eyes to the mirror; a fourth blesses her fortune at seeing him; a fifth thinks he will afford much enjoyment; etc.

1. Act I, sc. iii.
2. Act IV, sc. i.
3. Act II, sc. i.

Other French Types.

The fop proves to be the most distinctly French type character transferred to the English stage. He is present in more English comedies of the period under discussion, bears a more prominent part in the plays in which he appears, and, on the whole, attracts more interest and elicits more comment on the part of the English theatre-going public of the time than any other French character. He is a product distinctly French, the fruits of French customs. Accordingly, we shall find that most other French characters on the English stage possess foppish traits. The French footman and Valet de chambre are very like their fop masters; the barber and quack doctor feel that to pass for real Frenchmen, they mustassume the fop's whimsicalities; the tailor naturally dresses lavishly and acts the dandy as a stock in trade. In short, the English play-wright wished to present the Frenchman on thestage as fickle; hence he drew all French characters as more or less foppish.

Colley Cibber in Love's Last Shift, 1695, outlines the occupations of Frenchmen who sojourn in England. In this play, a character, Sir William wifewou'd, says:

> "You seem to be the Offspring of more than one man's Labour; for certainly no less than a Dancing, Singing, and Fencing-master, with a Taylor, Milliner, Perfumer, Peruke-Maker, French Valet de Chambre, coul'd be at the begetting of you."

Obviously these occupations were needed by Englishmen who came

with Charles II to provide the daily wants of Charles and his court. Frenchmen had filled these offices in France; and, as Englishmen at that time were not trained for, or suited to, that work, Frenchmen continued to hold them. The occupations, being constantly associated with Frenchmen, made these foreigners stand out as distinct and peculiar; accordingly they were soon looked upon as mere types through this prolonged association. These characters, judging from what follows, were no doubt frequent objects of banter and ridicule on the street, or among other servants in the homes.

After the fop the French servant is perhaps the most common French type represented. This type may be divided into four classes: the officious valet de chambre; the impudent footman; the cook; and the lady's maid. These persons have traits in common: they are usually petulant, impudent, and often insolent. They are ever in some intrigue against master or mistress, alone or with their fellow servants. They are constantly talking, and chafe when they cannot talk. In Etherege's Comical Revenge, Dufoy keeps murmuring about his master Sir Frederick. "Good Monsieur, what's the matter?" asks Clark, another servant. "De matré! Dufoy replies, "de matré is easy to perceive. Dis Bedlainé, madcapé, disable de matré, vas drunke de last night; and vor no reason, but dat me did advisé him to go to bed, begar, he did strike, breaké my head, Jernie." He vents his wrath against any one English-master, man, or maid - with "damn English," "rascal cherurgien English." His language soon becomes indecent; yet he is loyal to his master. When the whole household of English

servants strike for their wages, Dufoy alone remains loyal, and exclaims: "De devil také me if dare be not de whole regiment army de Hackené coachman, de linkeboy, de fydler, and de shamber maydé dat havé besiegé de house." On one of the servants' complaining to him against Sir Frederick, he defends Frederick with "ver it nod vor de reverence of me matré I vod cut off your occupation." In short, the French servant must talk and must be petulant.

The valet de chambre holds a position somewhat above other French servants; and he is conscious of this elevation. Peter Belon's The Mock Duellist, or The French Valet, 1675, has a valet, Champagne, who enters into an intrigue to help Sir Amorous elope with a lady, and is bidden to keep secret:

> Lord Amorous. - "Champagne, this is the night which is designed for my amorous theft: you must assist with secrecie, be sure?"
> Champagne. - (aside.) "Secrecy, Jerney, no sure for dat; me be all de secret, me have de secret to kill the Ratts, de Fleese, de Moose, de Tick; de secret to make de money, to make de charme, to call de prety Vensh ..... De secret - to run away vit your monee and close."

Earlier in the play Slye, rival of Sir Amorous for the same girl, bids Champagne to carry a note to the lady in question. The valet obeys, and stoops very dutifully to tie Slye's shoe-strings; but, at Slye's exit, cries, "'tis well you go, you make de escape, but me cash you again un odre tim ... mee voul extermin de you." To present a French servant as a peevish, irritable rival of his master very likely provided much amusement to the English spectators of the time.

Mrs. Centlivre's valet, Le Front, in The Perplex'd Lovers,

1712, has all the earmarks of other French valets. He is impudent to those whom he can bully, but subservient in the presence of his master. Having been slapped by Constantia to whom he makes love, he exclaims: "De devil take your Mutton first, Jerney blue, me have a good mind to knock you down, begar." When Lord Richlove asks Front where his rival, Bastion, is he suggests that he is even at that moment in the lady's chambre, and begs, - "let your Lordship's footman seize him and make a one Eunuch of him to supply Valentine's place in de Opera ... begar dat vill revenge your Lordship." Before his master he is always "Votre serviteur, Monsieur, tres humblement;" but before Bastion, who challenges him to a duel, he falls on his knees and begs:"De Devil take her jest, begar me must beg pardon ... de povre Refuge for Religion, mafoy, must do anyting for Bread." Le Front, however, combines much humor with his ill temper. As part of a message Bastion is to send by him to his master, he administers some Kicks; to this Le Front simply says "A very fine Present, begar." To the rest of the message, namely, "tell him, he sent them that would have sent his Lordship to the Devil tonight, if he had not prevented," Le Front answers, "Monsieur, begar me no like a de Message, you please to send a your own Servant, dat my Lor may return de Favour." Bastion threatens him for talking back, to which the valet replies "Me take a your Word for dat, begar, me no stay for de Proofe." This impudence on the one hand and servility on the other, is in complete contrast to the attitude of valets as represented on the French stage of the time. The valet on the French stage is represented more as a dignified friend than as a valet. In Boisey's

Le Conte de Neville, 1736, the valet, Nelton, is a wise discriminating, confidential man, who knowes his place. He discriminates between his class in England and in France:

"On le respecte à Londres, on L'admire à Paris."[1]

In no way does the English servant or valet on the French stage differ more from his French cousin on the English stage, than in his freedom from intrigue. Robinson in Favert's L'Anglois à Bordeaux, will shrewdly obtain money from his French friends, but it is to help his needly master not himself.[2] David in Falbaire's Le Fabricant de Londres, is completely unlike the Frenchman of his craft.[3] From love intrigues, therefore, the English valet in French comedy is wholly free, an intrigue which the French servant in English comedy makes part of his business. Le Front tries his amorous wiles on Constantia, whom his master loves.[4] La Poudre of Waldron's Maid of Kent is in collusion to ensnare his Lord's sweetheart.[5] La Nippe intrigues with Peggy in Burgoyne's Lord of the Manor. L'O Eillet in Life's Vagaries pretends to help his Lord elope with Augusta, but instead manages to carry away the lady himself.[6] These are representations of the French valet in English comedy for more than a hundred years; yet they always portray him the same, a plotter and a knave.

It is not, perhaps, prejudice that causes English playwrights to present French characters in an unfavorable light; rather is it a desire merely to make them comic characters, to lend amusement to the English public. Thus we find that the valet

1. Act I, sc. iii.
2. 1763.
3. 1771.
4. Peter Belon, 1675.
5. 1773.
6. "Life's Vagaries," John O'Keefe, 1795.

usually does not succeed in his plots, but is in the end generally made ridiculous, cuffed, and often beaten off the stage, no doubt to the intense delight of the spectators. When caught, Le Front falls upon his knees before Belvil and begs him not to press his challenge of a duel, promising to become his footman. La Nippe finds Peggy more than a match for him. She pretends to yield to his amorous advances, manages to get him intoxicated, and then has him dragged through a muddy ditch amid the jeers of the other servants. This treatment of officious French valets is shown in the case of La Fleur who says: "De law in dis country it give liberty; de liberty it break a de head, break a de house, put Frenchman in de horse-pond."[1]

The valet, no matter how impudent he may be, is not always defeated in the end. In Fashionable Lovers,[2] La Jeunesse learns that a Scotchman of importance in the play has lost his position. "Le pauvre Colin in disgrace," he cries. "Ha! ha! quelle spectacle!" He says he must have a word with Scotch Colin. Having found Colin he speaks as follows:-

> "I am inform my lord have sign your lettre de cachet: vat of dat? the air of Scotland will be for your health; England is not a country for les beaux esprits; de pure air of de Highlands will give you de grand appetit for de bonny clabber."

Colin comes back with the statement about the French not finding Scotland a jest in their last war. To this La Jeunesse retorts that the Scotch are "adroit enough at war," but none of them "know how to be at peace." Sharp, brisk, and sparkling repartee was so admired in that age of Swift, Pope, Fielding, and others,

1. "News from Parnassus," Arthur Murphy, I, i, 1776.
2. Richard Cumberland, 1772.
3. Cumberland, Act V, sc. i, 1772.

that English audiences seem to have expected it. We need not be surprised, then, to find it a quality even in the foreign types represented on the stage.

It may happen that the French valet is not the aggressor in a love intrigue, but merely a convenient tool for some other designing person. Such is the case in Vanbrugh's Provok'd Wife.[1] To save her mistress, Lady Fanciful, from being discovered by her husband in a compromising situation, the Lady's maid enters into a liaison with the valet de chambre to find out what happened at Spring-Garden; in this way she hopes to exculpate Lady Fanciful from the suspicion of intrigue with Constant. It might be said that intrigue was so common a motive in the comedy of the time, that the fact that a French valet chances to be a party in a plot may be merely incidental; however, the fact that he was so often used for the purpose, is worthy of consideration. Besides, the Frenchman seemed more natural and more graceful in a ridiculous position. Note the following scene from Burgoyne's Heiress.[2] The valet, Chignon, is made the love-agent between Clifford and Miss Alton. When Chignon sees Miss Alton he says, (aside) : -

> "Ma foi, là voila; I will lose no time to pay my addresse. Now for de humble manere, and de unperplex assurance of my countree. (Bowing with French shrug. Miss Alton turning over music-books). Madamoiselle, est-il permis? May I presume to offer you my profound homage? Madamoiselle, if you vill put your head into my hands, I vill give a distinction to your beauty, that shall make you and me de conversation of all de town."

We cannot think of an Englishman, or of a character of any other nationality, as suitable to a situation like this, except in

1. 1697.
2. "The Heiress," John Burgoyne, III, i, 1786.

eighteenth century comedy.

Humor is added by making the valet the object of sport for other characters in some plays of the time. Foote in The Commissary, gives us the following dialogue: -

> Mrs. Mechlin - "As I live, a squabble between him and La Fleur, the footman we hired this morning. This may make mirth."
> Fungus - (Enters driving footman before him).. Where is my brother, you rascal."
> La Fleur - "Je n'entend pas."
> Fungus - "Pay! what the devil is that? Answer yes or no!.. don't shrug your shoulders at me, you..." (and so forth).[1]

The same humorous purpose is served in Burgoyne's The Heiress. Chignon comes sideling in to intercept Alscripts' sight, and bowing as he looks toward Alscript. "What the devil," says Alscript, "is Monsieur at? I thought all his agility lay in his fingers: what antics is the monkey practicing. He twists and doubles as if he had a ramshew at his back."[2]

English play-wrights of our period loved to present the French valet or servant as starved. "A pox on my Valet de Chambre!" cries Selfish in Shadwell's True Widow, how he has tied my cravat up to Day! A man cannot get a good Valet de Chambre, French or English."[3] Bellamour answers, "A French one is fittest, because he can fast best." The same idea is expressed in The Woman Captain by Shadwell. Sir Humphry threatens to dismiss his troupe of servants and hire Frenchmen because they are fit for such slavery, being born and bred to it.[4] This idea of starved Frenchmen's being good for nothing except to work for their board, is shown

1. "The Commissary," Samuel Foote, I, i, 1765.
2. Act III, sc. i, 1786.
3. Act I, sc. i, 1765.
4. Act I, sc. i, 1680.

also in Mrs. Centlivre's Perplex'd Lovers. Here we find Le Front crying, "povre Refuge for Religion, mafoy, must do anyting for Bread."[1] The English loved to think of the French as being thin as a weasel, "half starved but always gay," even up to more recent times. It was part of their humorous attitude toward Frenchmen sojourning in London. Apparently, the presentation of French servants on the stage as being starved, also afforded much amusement to the audiences.

In his effort to create comic characters, the eighteenth century playwright usually placed them in situations more or less ridiculous or compromising; and since England was not friendly toward France at that time, the dramatists acceded to popular prejudice by making their French servants and valets dishonest, fickle, or depraved. Thus a servant thinks it unusual or unnecessary to be honest or civil; for, as Champagne avers, it is rather "de mee devoir to sheet," and the English would "no understand de civilite."[2] To jest at the expense of a Frenchman would sound well to the ears of "lowly John Bull," especially if it appealed to English patriotism; accordingly, when Le Front calls himself a dancing-master, and the English servant Timothy replies, "Ha! ha! I thought as much, for I have seen your Countrymen caper away before the Allies many a time,"[3] lowly John may join Timothy, in the laugh.

Yet in most instances as portrayed, the French servant has the advantage, and this is especially true in matters of love. In love intrigues the French servant can outwit his tormentors.

1. Act V, sc. iii.
2. "The Mock Duelist," Peter Bellon, I, i, 1675.
3. "The Perplex'd Lovers," III, iii, 1712.

O'Eillet having circumvented Monsieur Thomas and his Irish coachmen, gloats over the possession of Augusta: "Now Monsieur Thomas and dat villain Irish terrier may hunt her for deir own recreation."[1] O'Eillet is in Lord Torrendel's service to spy on the ladies for his lordship, and provides Torrendel with the trinkets and other gifts which are to serve as decoys to win the love of ladies for his lordship. The crafty spy tells us, "I buy at ten guinea and charge him (Torrendel) twenty." At this traffic he has made two thousand guineas, and so he can "vink at de Tradesman's bill." Such sly plots by servants, and the advice of Le Front to his master, Lord Richlove, to win Constantia's favor with "money, my Lor, money vil do all ting,"[2] would cause laughter even among occupants of the boxes; while the beaux seated on the stage would use the remarks as cues for their own wit combats. To the end of the eighteenth century the crafty, intriguing, and impertinent servant is popular in comedy. Le France quarrels with the coachman, duns his master for his pay, and becomes the butt of those about him.[3]

A French type almost as common in English comedy of this period as the valet, is the barber. Often a character who tries to pass for a dancing-master, tutor, physician, or even a nobleman, proves in the end, to be only a barber. Thus in The Humourist, Raymond accuses Pullin, now a French surgeon, of having been "an abominable barber." Raymond shows his contempt for Pullin, and the French, by accusing him of getting his start by selling the milk of a milch-ass; and tells how the Frenchman failed as

1. "Life Vagaries," O'Keefe, V, iii, 1795.
2. "The Artful Husband" - Taverner, III, ii, 1716.
3. "Roses and Thorns," Joseph Lunn, I, i, 1803.

a barber because of the roughness of his hands, due to milking.[1] On the English stage the French barber was held in contempt; hence when a character announced himself as a peruquier, he was perhaps received with a kick down stairs.[2] The French barber, like the French valet, is, accordingly, presented in as unfavorable light. To him are attributed all the vices commonly attributed to other Frenchmen on the English stage of the time. Frenchmen are vain, avaricious, pretentious, immoral. "Monsieur Cut-beard," or "Monsieur Powder-puff," as barbers were commonly called, are always engaged in questionable traffic. La Jeunesse induces young English gallants to buy his wigs. These wigs, he boasts, have had more intrigues than any gentleman in town. "My Lady Brilliante, my Lady Carmine, my Lady Bellair, Madam Lurewell - it was my wig ruin dem all."[3]

Money or power is the aim of the French barber as presented. La Roche goes to Bury Fair to find "de pretty garl vid de cheveux blonde."[4] His object is to "buy de vite lock, indeed to gette de Mones to make de Pot Boyle." La Roche as a peruquier is superior to all others, even to Chedreux. "No man can Travaille vid" him. He will however gladly pass for a count, that will bring him the money. When Wildish out of sport would pass La Roche for a French count, he is pleased. "Ha, ha, ha, de French Count! dat be ver well: Ha, ha, Make de Love! begar, I come for make de Monee." Wildish lures the Frenchman into a liaison with a woman, and when the barber consents, the Englishman calls

1. "The Humourist" - Shadwell, I, i, 1670.
2. "Bury Fair" - Shadwell, IV, i, 1689.
3. "No One's Enemy but His Own," Arthur Murphy, I, i, 1764.
4. "Bury Fair" - Shadwell, I, ii, 1689.

him "thou true Picture of a French Scoundrel." Yet these barbers as presented must not be looked upon as common or ordinary persons, they would have us know. Misfortune may indeed have reduced them to the position of peruquier, but they are still persons of quality.

Bluff and braggadocio are other qualities commonly accredited to the French barber on the English stage of the eighteenth century. He is quick to resent an affront, and ready to offer a challenge; but he quails in the presence of his adversary. Bagatelle is a rival of Patrick for the hand of an Irish maid. Patrick calls the barber a "rascally hair-dresser." Immediately the Frenchman flares up: "Hair-dresser! Monsieur, you shall give me de satisfaction; I vill challenge you and vill meet you vid -" "With your curling-irons."[1] The Irishman retorts. The duel is arranged with pistols as the weapons. When, however, the time for action arrives, the barber withdraws.

A type of Frenchman recurring in eighteenth century English comedy is the sham doctor. In some cases he works on his own initiative; in others he is the tool of some other designing person. The fake physician, like other French fakers in London, seems to have been present in large numbers. Shadwell speaks of this type as follows:

> "They begin to be as rife amongst us as their country diseases; and do almost as much mischief too: no cover without French taylors, weavers, milliners, strong-watermen, perfumers, and surgeons."[2]

In The Humourist, a character, Crasy, enumerates his diseases. Tullin, the fake, answers him: "Vel! and have I no cure all dese?" Tullin's cure-all was to put his patient "in de cradle and vid

1. "The Poor Soldier," - O'Keefe, I, ii, 1798.
2. "The Humourist," I, i, 1670.

spirit of vine in de pope lanthorn," a very intelligible treatment, to be sure. In a later comedy La Fleur, a valet turned physician, can, by the use of his magnetic wand, cure and completely recreate any person.[1]

The French corn-doctor makes his appearance occasionally in English comedy of the time. Fryzellette de la Carneille, whose name suggests a former occupation that he may have had, tries but fails to get a position as tutor; accordingly he turns corn-doctor. In ten years he claims to have risen from poverty to affluence. Gulwell puts up an advertisement for him: "Hair and corns cut after the French taste by a person of quality." The Frenchman, greatly pleased, says, "Ay, dat vil do ver vell. Par un parsonne qualite."[2] As is usual with these fake Frenchmen, this corn-doctor soon plots to run away with a rich young woman. He wants to "geté de vife vid not less as von hundred tousand livres."

The sham-doctor in these comedies is an impositor, with money as his sole end, naturally. In The Little Hunchback, the "Doctor" refuses poor patients, but never is too busy for a rich one. When Juggy reports to him a man severely injured, he shouts:

> "Ventre Bleu! you tink I am to take into my house all de bad vagabond you pick out of de street? Alley - bring him to vatch-house for to-night, and in de morning dey will send him to de hospital - take de man from my door."[3]

He is however told that the man's clothes prove him to be some great personage. So the Frenchman changes front at once:

1. "Annual Magnetism," I, i, 1788.
2. "The Register Office," Joseph Reed, I, i, 1761.
3. O'Keefe, Act II, sc. iv, 1798.

> "Eh! by gar, his coat do shine vid gold... I vil never turn out a good patient; bring de gentleman in, I vil cure him in half of tree minutes."

When later it appears that the patient may die, the "Doctor" cries "Ah, malheureux, den I've lost my fee!" The satire in this scene is obvious. Sham medical practice must have been common in London during the century, and must have appealed strongly to Frenchmen of doubtful crafts about town.

Some of the Frenchmen as represented aspire to higher honors than obtain in some vocation. They would be noblemen. The person pretending quality, or sham-nobleman, appears often in comedy of the century. The purpose of presenting some of these characters was, no doubt, merely to afford rollicking fun for the spectators, for the Frenchman is always placed in a positionof discomfiture. In The Prisoner at Large, such a Frenchman is presented on a large estate in Ireland, where he has gone to collect the rent. When he appears, the tenants throw mud and stones at him, spoil his curls ("knock o' my hair out of my buckle"), and call him "Jacky Frog."[1] The playing of the Irish against the French occurs quite often in English comedy of the eighteenth century.

A charateristic situation of the fake nobleman discomfitted is found in Fontainbleu. As Colonel Epaulette introduces Le Prince to Mademoiselle and Lady Bull, Sir John Bull cries, "You! Lady Bull introduced to a taylor!" To this the Frenchman replies, "Taylor! Sacrestie! Monsieur, if you were not an Englishman, your life should answer for dis affront."[2] Such a dialogue speaks for itself. It is intended to play to the pride of a

1. O'Keefe, Act II, sc. i, 1798.
2. Ibid. Act I, sc.ii, 1798.

pro-English theatre-audience. It did not need a Frenchman to provide this triumph for John Bull; he used all other foreigners in a similar way.

The foregoing sham French characters were buffeted and tumbled about merely for the edification of English audiences long prejudiced against the French. It was a common belief in England that Frenchmen were, for the most part, frauds. The Frenchman in London may have in part justified such an opinion; the political relations of the two countries, and the constant agitation about popery would contribute to the feeling. So Foote found Frenchmen frauds even as critics. To the French critic discernment, knowledge, and honesty are not necessary:-

> "We copy the title page of a new book; we never go any further. If we are ordered to praise it, we have at hand about ten words which, scattered through as many periods, effectually does the business; as, laudable design, happy arrangement, spirited language, argument. If we are to decry, then we have unconnected, flat false, illiberal, stricture, reprehensible, unnatural - these are the arms with which we engage authors of all kinds. To us all subjects are equal; plays or sermons, poetry or politics, music or midwifery, it is the same thing."[1]

In this way Foote satirizes French literary critics. To the Englishman all Frenchmen were apparently sham.

That this adverse treatment of foreigners was due to national prejudice can easily be shown. It was said that the French drama of the eighteenth century would not present the catholic priest on the ground that thus to desecrate the cloth was an impossible sacrilege.[2] French playwrights of the time did, however, represent the English minister, and portrayed him

1. "The Liar," I,i, 1764.
2. Fenouillot de Falbaire, "Le Fabricant de Londres," 1737.

as a sanctimonious hypocrite. On the converse, the English comedy did not satirize a protestant minister, but often represented the catholic priest as bad. Scrub tells the "French" priest Foiguard: "I won't be saved your way - I hate a priest: I abhor the French.... I will spill the last drop of my blood to keep out popery."[1] The English did not confine their dislike of priesthood to the French, however, for the comedy of the time is full of the severest censure and the keenest satire against Irish priests.

The attitude of the English toward Frenchmen in London is represented in French comedy of the time quite correctly. The English admired the French social graces and quick repartee; but they feared French loose morals and amorous intrigues. Love intrigue was a part of the English comedy of the eighteenth century; but the love intrigues of French types on the English stage had a character all their own. These personages form a type of Frenchmen prevalent throughout the period. D'Urfey exemplifies the amorous intriguer in Le Prate, who replies to Amour when the latter asks what makes this "French Puppy here grinning:"-

> "A rare Creature, both for de Shape, de Wit, de Beauty, and everyting.... Now you must know dat as intreaging is de very soul of de French, and myself being always great Admirer of dat Gallantry, I have endear my merit as much in her Favour, by de Song, de Fiddle, de Present, and oderting shall be nameless."[2]

As Le Prate's speech suggests, this is a case of illicit love, of amorous intrigue, pure and simple. In these plots the Frenchmen

1. "Beaux Stratagem," Farquhar, IV, i, 1707.
2. "Love for Money," Durfey, III, ii, 1691.

usually boasts of his rank and wealth, either to exalt himself in the lady's eyes, or in the eyes of others, or to tantalize and enrage his rivals. The lady in question may not have the least interest in him; she may, indeed repel him, or make him the butt of ridicule. Yet the intriguing foreigner will persevere, and boast of his conquest in a way truly superlative. So in Love for Money, Le Prate works on the jealousy of his rival Amour to such a degree that Amour cries "Damnation," and calls him"a downright Devil."[1]

As in the case with amorous young Frenchmen of this early period, Le Prate shows many of the qualities of the fop. Young Merriton calls him "a singing, dancing, talking, fluttering nothing." Later Merriton adds, "he's a great Intriguer, too, but then 'tis the French way, that is, he never brings it to effect." These characters help the action -- keep things moving, help to involve the plot, and amuse the audience -- then disappear as did all other fops. Like the fop the intriguer sings and plays before his lady's window, until she bids him to know that "pitiful fidling and piping" cannot "win a lady of her Beauty and Quality." Le Prate also boasts of his achievements, and how he has circumvented his rivals; and like the fop reveals his greed for money. We see in him the gay, care-free, light-hearted spirit, characteristic of the dandy:

> "I perceive dat she be ver dam jilt, ma foy; and tho I have lost de little Honour in de quarrel, I have save one hundred guinea, morbleau, vish make me ver much amends."

Then he offers to show "the finest French song dat I learnt dis morning," and with a "thol, thol, loll," he passes off the stage.

1. Thomas Durfey,III, ii, 1696.

Another amorous intriguer with a fortune as a motive in his plots appears in The Gamester. Here the Frenchman is a footman, who tries to pass for a French Marquis, and whose object is the rich Lady Wealthy. We hear him boast of his rank and valor: "I have fought a Hundred Duels, and never fail'd to kill or wound, without the least Hurt myself..... Fortune owes my life Protection, for the Sake of the noble Race from which I sprang." Then he gets to his real subject; he charges Valere with being a rival:-

> "Sir, there is a certain Lady that has a Passion for my Person... I am informed by her woman, that you make your addresses there; now, Sir, I suffer no man beneath my Quality to mix his Pretentions with mine."[1]

Marquis is so persistent in charging Valere with interfering in his courtship of Lady Wealthy, that Valere is compelled to draw his sword and threaten him. Immediately the Frenchman retracts; he is very apologetic, "Upon my word, Sir, I was in Jest all the while." Hector enters to add his denunciations: "What the Devil do you come into our Nation to crow over us... your capering Country is better for Dancing Masters than Soldiers." When Marquis sees Lady Wealthy later, however, his boastful spirit has reasserted itself. He tells how he drew on Valere for speaking in a way "Prejudicial to the Reputation" of Lady Wealthy; and that Valere, frightened out of his wits, had "disclaimed his Passion, and said I might take you with all his Heart." When Valere thus showed the white feather, Marquis declares that he stepped up to him with "Savez-vous, Monsieur, du Lansquene," which means "a flip of the Nose;" and that "the good Gentleman pull'd off his Hat, and made me the lowest bow." We find in

1. "The Gamester," Mrs. Centlivre, III, i, 1705.

Marquis the pretence, the boastfulness, the cowardice, which characterize the usual amorous intriguing Frenchman of these comedies.

The amorous intriguing Frenchman seems to disappear from English comedy for about a half century. He reappears, however, in The Register Office, and is present in many comedies to the end of the century. This Frenchman, a tutor, is a cousin of Monsieur Fryzellette de la Carneille, whom we have mentioned above. Since his cousin could run away "wit de Angeloise young lady, sa belle écoliere," why should not he? To get de vife vid not less as von hundred tousand livres"[1] is a strong temptation; so he will attempt to do the act. To this end he is in England.

In Lord of the Manor, the French La Nippe uses Peggy as an accomplice in his love intrigues. La Nippe is an advanced thinker; he has a "new philosophy," "Speak out," says Peggy, "I am to seduce my mistress for -" "Fie," La Nippe interupts! "What names you are giving things! That child, is not the new philosophy!"[2] La Nippe urges Peggy to enduce her mistress to accept the hand of Contrast. Then the Frenchman and Peggy as agents in the plot are to divide the spoils. He tells her she is the girl after his own heart, and asks when they shall meet.

In general the amorous intriguer meets with rebuff and defeat. He is a braggart the other characters love to humiliate, or a fop they love to pommel and make ridiculous. In He Would be a Soldier, Count Pierpont finds a ready listener, though one apparently averse to his advances, in Lady Oldstock:

1. "The Register Office," Joseph Reed, 1761.
2. John Burgoyne, III, ii, 1781.

Pierpont - "Mais madam! may I beg leave to solicit?" (He siezes her hand.)
Lady Oldstock - "O, heavens!.... How fatal to the happiness of both - I hope, my lord, you will exert your philosophy on this occasion, and consider the unsurmountable obstacle."[1]

She bids him to "endeavor to extinguish a fruitless flame," but adds that he is a "too pleasing seducer," then she effects to weep. She advises him to consider that he is in England, and though it "may be the etiquette of France to treat a married lady with so much attention, it is in England very dangerous. Pierpont presses his suit: "Ah! madam, have a some pity on those whom your charms enslave; quand L'amour est dans le coeur, il fait l'esprit comme lui même." Lady Oldstock is so far won over that she says the French are certainly the most agreeable people in the world. Pierpont had first courted the daughter, Harriet, then turned his attentions to the mother. The play almost ends seriously, but the Frenchman succeeds in extricating himself by his native gallantry. In The Fugitive, we get the worst sort of the Amorous intriguer type. Julia is a fugitive in the home of Larron. Larron tries to seduce her. "De Torrough-bred trader know how to faire son frofit de chaque circomstance."[2] is his excuse for so doing. She calls him a mercenary wretch, and tries to escape. Mrs. Larron, who is really not Larron's wife, becomes jealous of the young lady and abuses her. The Larrons appear only in the early part of the play, and have, therefore, little to do with the plot. Apparently they are introduced, as usual, largely to amuse the audience who liked to ridicule or satirize the French adventurous and licentious intriguers.

1. Frederick Pilon, III, i, 1786.
2. Joseph Richardson, III, iv, 1784.

O'Keefe presents the amorous adventurer in two plays. In Fontainebleau,[1] Lapoche thinks there is something in his "air dat is grande." So, for him to stick to his tailor trade, he thinks, wrongs his "bon addresse," and accounts for "Madam Rosa's Scorn." "If de Lady de Bull did take me for a colonel," he continues, "dressed as I vas, vat must I be a-la-mode de noblesse?" Accordingly he dresses in the clothes of Marquis de Papillion and pays his addresses to Rosa: "Oh you pretty pattern for de taylor's wife! I do adore you; and de dimple of your chin, and your hand soft as English broadcloth; your lip, Genoa velvet, and your eye, bright as de Birmingham button." He thinks England a great field for such soldiers of fortune as he. He congratulates Rosa on her having escaped the rogue Henry; then, having discovered that Henry is aware of his plots, he feigns great friendship for his rival. This chameleon-like change of front is common to Frenchmen as represented. Henry accuses Lapoche of having a "character" for every country. The Frenchman replies gayly that he has, including "a Tailor à votre service," and at once sets about soliciting Henry's trade. Then he turns to Rosa again, and continues his love-making.

This double ambition of the French intriguer, namely, love and money, is well illustrated in The Man-Milliner. Coeffeuse, the milliner, has married awidow because their combined business, his millinery and her haberdashery, will "make de money." Mrs. Coeffeuse also thinks itwas a shrewd piece of business to have combined their fortunes thus. She, however, warns her husband

1. "Fontainebleau," III, iv, 1784.

not to be too free with the girls in their shop. "Even a kiss wou'd vex" her. Coeffeuse assures her that he would be glad to see a girl "dare to kiss" him. He wishes "he cou'd catch them at that work."[1] Then he proceeds to form love matches between his shop girls and other men, and to extort money for his services.

The French tutor is a common type represented in eighteenth century English comedy. We hear Papillion in The Lyar say: "At a pinch Sir, I am either a teacher of tongues, a friseur, a dentist, or a dancing-master, these are hereditary professions to Frenchmen."[2] We do not find the French dentist in eighteenth century English comedy, but the barber, dancing-master, valet, and tutor abound. Although a Swiss friend has suggested to Papillion that nothing would so open the doors now shut against him as that of a French valet de chambre, yet the Frenchman decides to become a tutor. He has had experience, that of "sub-preceptor to one of those cheap, rural academies" with which the country of York was plentifully stocked. To show his fitness for his new position, we may quote him on his experience in his old one: -

> "The whole region of the belles lettres fell under my inspection...There like another Aristarch I dealt out fame and damnation at pleasure...I have condemned books I never read; and applauded the fidelity of a transition, without understanding one syllable of the original."[3]

Accordingly, we find the French tutor represented as a fake, even as we have found his compatriots in other lines of endeavor represented; all of which is in strong contrast with the frank, open,

1. 1787.
2. "The Lyar," Samuel Foote, I, i, 1764.
3. Ibid.

unconpromising attitude of Englishmen as represented in French comedies of the time.

The difference between the English and the French attitude toward each other as represented in comedy is illustrated in The Rage. In this play the French tutor is a music master. Signet, the Frenchman, urges Mrs. Darnley to have her boy take lessons, because "it is necessary for his education - put de fiddle in his little hand, and let him scrape away! den he will be great man like me; and call for hot supper and best bed ver-ever he go." Mrs. Darnley has thought of making the boy a parson. Signet ridicules the plan. "Vat," says he, "is de parson to de musician?" He tells how a parson rides a horse, preaches in four or five churches, and for his labor gets £40 a year. He and his wife on the other hand, "ride in vis-a-vis - sing only ven we like, and make £5000 a year - ah ha! voilà la difference - Parson begar!" Mrs. Darnley, however, rebukes Signet, saying that it is a shame in a country "where foreign arrogance is so rewarded, and gentlemanly merit insulted."[1] As in this case, so in general, the genuine Englishman is out of sympathy with French pretence. Rarely do we find the Frenchman introduced in a way to win him sympathy. Usually traits in him which are obnoxious to the English are accentuated, among which are conceit and arrogance. Thus, on entering, Signet at once asks Mrs. Darnley and Clara Sedley what their names are. Clara replies, "Rather we should ask yours." "Mine!" he cries, - "Diable! do you not know me? ... Vat! not know I am Signor Cygnet? de first violin in Europe! de best composer in

1. "The Rage," Frederick Reynolds, I, i, 1795.

de whole world!" He complains of his bed and supper, and says he will have the best bed or will take his fiddle and "promenez." He boasts of how the Grand Duke never used him thus; of how, when he was in Florence, the Duke quarreled with all his ministers - "all but me...me! - me he shake by de hand, and go to my vife's benefit tout le même." In speaking of Shakespeare Signet admits that he has made "a little noise," but that soon "de fiddle and de bravura will lay him on de shelf."[1] The plot of The Rage seems for the most part, to have been borrowed from Steel's Lying Lovers, and is to a degree satirical.

This spirit of contempt for Frenchmen in English comedy prevailed throughout the Restoration, and into the eighteenth century. In The Feigned Curtezans we find much the same. The foreigner here is a Fencing-master. Tickletext, who has not taken kindly to Petro's, the Frenchman's, instructions, objects to his using the single-rapier. "What would you have for de Gentleman," says Petro, "de cudgel for de Gentleman?" The Englishman retorts that he would have the cudgel for the "Rascally Frenchman who comes to abuse Persons of Quality with paltry Single-Rapiers."[2] They quarrel until Tickletext beats the fencing-master about the stage, and Petro howls in terror, "Ah, Monsieur, Monsieur, will you kill a me?" We have here again the Frenchman painted as a pretentious cad, and made ridiculous for the amusement of English audiences.

The same contempt obtains in a play by George Powell near the end of the seventeenth century. In this play Courtwitt, an

1. "The Rage," Reynold's I, i, 1795.
2. Aphra Behn, I, ii, 1679.

Englishman, is disguised as a French dancing-master. Mrs. Sneaksby satirizes the French character by saying to Courtwitt, "Pardon me, Monsieur, if I speak beyond your Capacity of Understanding." She also hints at there being no well-bred gentlemen in France. The attitude may be illustrated further in Venice Reclaimed.

In the Prologue to this play we have the following lines:-

"Humour, which once prevail'd, is laid aside,
And Can't appear but by some Foreign Aid;
Singing and Dancing is the only Grace,
And Shakespeare's well wrought scenes will have
no place.
.....
What was of old for English Hearts design'd,
Is grown so coarse, it can no welcome draw,
Unless attended by some French Kickshaw."[1]

In the play itself the author speaks contemptuously of certain French refugees chattering like Babel about politics, of which they know nothing, and "Settling the nation and lying for subsistence."

It seems strange that the French tailor did not become a distinct type in eighteenth century comedy, in as much as fashions in dress were so largely borrowed from the French. The tailor does not, however, appear frequently in the comedy of the time. The first appears in Sir Hercules Buffoon,[2] 1684; but he plays a very insignificant part in the drama. In 1693 D'Urfey presents a French tailor as "some new Lunaticks."[3] The reasons for the Frenchman's presence in London, and the English attitude toward him, is shown in the words of a servant, Christopher. Christopher calls the tailor a spindlelegg'd Frenchman who, since the war, was

1. "Venice Reclaimed," Richard Wilkinson, 1703.
2. "Sir Hercules Buffoon," John Lacy, 1684.
3. "Richmond Heiress," Thomas Durfey, IV, ii, 1693.

at a loss howto get new fashions for his whimsical customers. Not until near the end of the next century do we find another French tailor; then several appear, namely, in Love in the City;[1] in Fontainebleau; and in Man-Milliner.

In none of these three plays does the French tailor prove an important person. Lapoche, in Fontainebleau, finds England a great field "for the soldier of fortune." He had been "cooke parfumeur, matre de langue, juggle, and toos-drawer;" in short, he says that he was "everyting."[2] Now, however, he is himself in his "true character - a tailor a vôtre service." Like most Frenchmen represented in English comedies of the century, Lapoche is soon involved in a love intrigue; like many of his compatriots he was "vonce a great man," but is now reduced. We have met with O'Keefe's French tailor before. He is the man who married the haberdashery of the widow Bombasin, because their combined business would "make de money." Uniting their shops would mean a "fortune at my foot, like dis silver shoe-buckle." This infrequent appearance of the French tailor may, however, hardly justify our classifying him as a type.

1. "Love in the City," Isaac Bickerstoffe, 1767; "Fontainebleau," John O'Keefe, 1784; and "The Man-Milliner," 1798.
2. Act II, sc. i.

Irish Types.

When a dramatist writes a comedy, he creates for it characters that will amuse, that is, characters that are the objects of mirth. Such isthe province of comedy; it treats beings that are inferior. English dramatists after the Restoration held the Irishman as inferior, eccentric, outlandish; and so represented him in an unfavorable light. Later in the eighteenth century "Patrick" compelled recognition for many worthy qualities; but during the Restoration period, and throughout the first half of the next century, the Irishman on the stage is ignorant, improvident, uncouth. We find him, in general, coarse, swaggering, profane, indecent in his speech, abounding in alehouse jests. His ignorance is profound: he has "less than six ideas out of his profession of soldier,"[1] Macklin tells us. But we cannot expect much more from one who at the age of fifteen joined a foreign regiment. Since he came from Ireland, he was a sloven. "He made me go by a dirty Place like a Laugh now, and therefore I know it was the way to Ireland,"[2] shows the man as well as the country. To the Irishman as represented, women have no "innate principle of virtue,"[3] be they sister or countess. He is a swaggerer, a dissolute brawler. In Tunbridge Walks we find him a "rake with a dirty double Button-coat, a cursed long sword, and a damn'd Irish face, with more Independence than the Box-Reepers

1. "Love à la Mode," I, i, 1760.
2. "The Committee," Sir Robert Howard, V, i, 1692.
3. "Love in a Bottle," - Fraquhar, I, i, 1699.

that are always leazing Quality for Money."[1] Even the Irish woman is represented as bad. Moll Flagon shares the bottle with her consort, objects to the damn'd hat he has got, calls him a "jolly dog" and "my son of sulphur," and promises to stick to him through life.[2] This type of Irishman is a thief, but he knows he can rob honorably by turning soldier. - He is a prodigal:

> "His (Pat O'Leary's) wants were big, his means were small,
> His wisdom less, and so he spent his all;
> When Fortune turned about, and jilted Pat,
> Was Fool or Fortune in the fault of that?"[3]

That the impression the Englishmen had of their Hibernian cousin was unfavorable; that they thought him bad regardless of rank or station, is evidenced by the frequency with which he is so painted, by the almost complete absence of any comment in his favor, and by the fact that in the latter half of the century Macklin, Macready, and others made concerted and organized effort to change public sentiment in his favor. After this he was no longer characterized "as a designing and mercenary fortune-hunter."[4]

Habits most commonly associated with Irishmen in the seventeenth and eighteenth century English comedy are drinking and fighting. The Irish character almost always indulges in one or the other of these dissipations. Witness, a character, has "drunk about a thousand times usquebah in Florio;"[5] Major Rakish swears "by the pleasure of drinking;"[6] O'Dragheda debates with Strap the virtues of usquebaugh;[7] the daughter of Patrick O'Neale was sacrificed to the "most senseless, drunken, profligate"[8] in the

1. Thomas Baker, II, i, 1703.
2. "The Apprentice," Thomas Murphy, 1756.
3. "Wheel of Fortune," Richard Cumberland, Epilogue, 1795.
4. "Eminent Actors," William Archer, Pt. III, p. 131.
5. "City Politicks," - Crowne, V, iii, 1675.
6. "Woman's Wit," - Cibber, IV, i, 1697.
7. "The Orators," - Foote, II, i, 1762.
8. "The Irish Widow," - Garrick, I, i, 1772.

country; Murtoch calls whiskey his darling, which causes him to stagger whenever they chance to meet,[1] and Maister Pat in the same play lies stretched out on the floor after emptying the best part of two bottles; O'Whack sleeps out all night "drunk with usquebaugh";[2] and Aircourt finds that "Irish claret glides down like new milk."[3] We should not conclude that these Irish characters are wholly bad, for they all show some good traits at times; yet the English play-wright obviously wished to draw his neighbor of the Emerald Isle as bad. England seemed unsympathetic toward anyone from Ireland. We may note from the accompanying dates, that even the efforts of Macklin and others, did not dispel the habit of making Pat an unfavorable character.

A still more common fault attributed to the Irish type is fighting. Thechallenge is ever hanging out, and the terms in which it is usually couched are picturesque. Major Oakley presumes that a duel is "a common breakfast" with O'Cutter; and O'Cutter enumerates the duels he fought when he was in Dublin last.[4] O'Flaherty will have a certain paper from Varland, or he will not leave one whole bone in his "skin that shan't be broken."[5] In The Irish Widow, even a woman, disguised as a soldier, swaggers, draws sword, and threatens Whittle, another character, with "by my soul but I would have taught the better manners."[6] Of course, we all remember the famous duel between Lucius O'Trigger and Captain Absolute in The Rivals.[7] Brawls in taverns and fights in streets

1. "The Irishman in London," - Mocready, II, i, 1793.
2. "Notoriety," Frederick Reynolds, 1792.
3. "The Lie of the Day," O'Keefe, III, ii, 1796.
4. "The Jealous Wife," - Colman IV, i, 1761.
5. "The West Indian," - Cumberland, IV, ii, 1771.
6. Garrick, II, i, 1772.
7. Sheridan, V, iii, 1775.

were opportune in that day when usequebaugh, flowing freely, heated the blood, and when the ready sword flew easily from the scabbard, or the shillelah was flourished in the hand.

Of course, these characters were gentlemen, and gentlemen must defend their reputation. Baldernoe really thinks himself "a modest gentleman"; but he adds: "S'blood, I baffled an impudent Irish Chanceryman in his own blundering way; I put Eikon Basilike out of conceit with himself."[1] Why should the Irishman not fight? He was an important personage - he was sure of this - and his honor was assailed. Might not I, Sir Lucius, have married Lady Dorothy Carmine, "if it had not been for a little rogue of a major, who ran away with her before she could get a sight of me?"[2] The Irishman in these comedies was always a "jontleman," or a "jintleman," whatever others might class him. He would prove his boast with the shillelah, which always served well to break a head. "I'm Sir Larry M'Murragh of Bellygrauman - Cloufergus," and "by the honor - "[3] then there is a fight. Roebuck cries, "Have at thee! St. George for England!" Patrick and Bagatelle, the barber, settle their differences in a duel. Mac Dermot clinches his fist until the muscles are tense as whipcords, and - he hisses - "if your your lordship was not a lord now!" O'Brallaghan fights Scotch Archy for one alleged insult, then challenges the Italian Mordecai for another. This pugnacious front and boastfulness are ever foremost in the sons of Erin Isle, as they strut about the stage of the Restoration and the next century; but they are gallant gentlemen, who may well

1. "A Plot and no Plot," John Dennis, I, i, 1697.
2. "The Rivals," - Sheridan, IV, iii, 1775.
3. "Who Wants a Guinea," George Colman, II, ii, 1805.

dispute a point of honor or speak of their exploits.

Such were the traits common to the Irish as represented in the English comedy of the seventeenth and eighteenth century. There are, however, certain distinct types into which the Irishmen fall, regardless of the traits mentioned. Chief of these types is the free-lance soldier. We may call him free-lance, for he is of a roving disposition, is purchasable, serves on his own responsibility, without control by party or authority, under any commander and in any country. All he asks is suitable pay, plenty to eat, and a deal of fighting. He is a veritable condottiere. Being of a care-free spirit, fond of adventure, capable of bearing hardship, and willing to serve for pay, it was only natural that the Irishman should take service in foreign lands. "Love, fighting, or whiskey, 'tis all the same to me" says Armagh in The Wife of Two Husbands,[1] and he sings a drinking song. The Irishman liked the atmosphere of camp life; he preferred it to cultivated civil life. Macklin presents Sir Callaghan, who was not born in a school of fine compliment, but "in an academy where heads and legs and arms and bullets dance country dances without the owner's leave; just as the fortune of war directs."[2] Callaghan whose title "Sir" is assumed merely as a token of respectability, has had from childhood a "kind of military madness." Charlotte, a character in the play, calls him a hard-headed soldier, whose "fondness for his profession" made her fancy that he was born in a siege; that Bellona had been his nurse; and that the Furies had been his playfellows. Major O'Flaherty has followed the trade of

1. "The Wife of Two Husbands," James Cobb, III, ii, 1803.
2. "Love a la Mode," Charles Macklin, I, i, 1760.

fighting for thirty years and in many countries: in the year before last he was "in an Irish brigade in France"; last year he followed "the fortunes of the German eagle" as a grenadier, where he had his fill "of fighting and plentiful scarcity of everything else"; next we find him "with the confederates in Poland." He has had a British bullet in his body; and, while fighting in twenty-six battles in Germany, he had received a "gash in his skull."[1] Patrick has served in America, and was wounded at Battie's Ford.[2] Captain Mullinahack has accepted a commission in France.[3] Armagh is captured by Banditti while fighting in Italy.[4]

The fact, however, that the Irish soldier is represented as fighting under many flags and against many foes on the continent, does not mean that he is disloyal to England. Although Mullinahack fights in France, he says, "let me be blown from the mouth of a cannon when I turn my face as an enemy against Great Britain."[5] He calls England his "honor'd country" and her ruler his "gracious King." Likewise Armagh, who has fought in Italy, declares he is not ashamed of his birth-place; it is "in the next parish to Old England." He calls Great Britain and Ireland "as pretty a pair of islands as ever providence coupled together in the salt sea"; and adds, "may that providence never permit them to be disunited."

This loyalty to Great Britain has a parallel in the Irishman's love for his own country. Sir Callaghan, mentioned above,

1. "The West Indian," Richard Cumberland, II, vii, 1771.
2. "The Poor Soldier," - O'Keefe, I, i, 1793.
3. "The World in a Village," O'Keefe, 1793.
4. "The Wife of Two Husbands," James Cobb, I, i, 1803.
5. "The World in a Village," - O'Keefe, V, i, 1793.

will not believe that Scotland is superior to Ireland. Nor does he believe in Scotch history, for it never speaks the truth; but the Irish history "must be the best," because it "was written by an Irish poet of my own family,"[1] he informs us. He calls Irish people superior to the Scotch since Scotland, he holds, was settled by the Irish: "the youngest branch of our family, one Fergus O'Brallaghan went from Carrick-fergus, and peopled all Scotland with his own hands." This the Scotchman resents, and they draw and fight. Of course the whole effect is farcical. The English play-wright has carried national traits and national prejudices to absurdity. We shall assume, however, that such speeches by actors of Irish parts greatly amused English audiences.

Loyalty seems to have been a trait strongly marked in the Irishman of the time, for it is strongly emphasized by dramatists. The Irish soldier is always loyal and faithful to whomever he serves. Callaghan will not leave military service in Prussia even at the request of Charlotte, whose hand he has asked in marriage; for, he says, "Now I am come to a title and fortune, and that he (King of Prussia) has need of my service, I think I would look like a poltroon to leave him."[2] He holds his duty sacred. Likewise, Lieutenant O'Connor, when another character swears that he would rather see his daughter "in a scarlet fever than in the arms of a soldier," replies "Upon my word the army is much obliged."[3] So he will marry the daughter first and ask consent afterwards; but he will not desert his regiment in Prussia. Even when a purse is offered him as a bribe, he throws it away, for he would rather fight than do the dishonorable. Lauretta

1. "Love a la Mode," Charles Macklin, I, i, 1760.
2. Ibid.
3. "St. Patrick's Day," - Sheridan, II, iv, 1775.

refuses him because his principles are too military for her. Yet he "will not quit the field," but "will reconnoitre her once more"; that is, he will try to make her heart fonder by absence - he will ride "post to Germany." He wins the girl, for playwrights by the latter part of the eighteenth century purposely depicted the Irishman in Comedy as high-minded, honorable, and gentlemanly.

The Irishman loved adventure; he wanted to see the world; and he expected promotion. Yet these were often not the only, or the chief, reasons for his turning soldier. Life in his native country was hard. Ireland was densely populated, her people were oppressed, and chances for more than a bare existence there were small. To many young Irishmen, the future in their own country was dark; it could not be worse in foreign service, where they at least had enough to eat, and their services were welcomed. Roebuck is a wild Irishman of a roving disposition, and he is penniless. He dares not resort to robbery or theft at home. "But hold," he cries, "can't I rob honorably by turning soldier."[1] On seeing a crippled beggar he says, "thy condition, fellow, is preferable to mine; the merciful bullet more kind than thy ungrateful country, has given thee a débénture in thy broken leg from which thou canst draw a more plentiful maintenance than I from all my limbs."[2] Roebuck accordingly flees Ireland that he may escape providing for his wife and children.

Other conditions than poverty are represented as driving young Hibernians from home. Moll encourages her lover, Contrast, to become a soldier, because he would look well as such. She puts

1. "Love in a Bottle," - Farquhar, I, i, 1699.
2. Ibid.

a soldier's hat and knapsack on him and calls him her "son of sulphur."[1] Darby is fighting in Russia because the "jade Kathleen jilted him."[2] In the same play Pat has followed Darby because "that cursed pair of colors" that Captain Fitzray clap'd into Darby's fist set him "all agog."

We may conclude, then, that English play-wrights wished to paint the Irish soldier as a fair scion of the "miles gloriousus." He is a fighter, a braggart, a boaster, and more or less a roisterer. Sir Callaghan fights a duel over which, he or his rival, can drink the most liquor in honor of his mistress; O'Connor must warn his men not to spend their money for whiskey; Major Rakish speaks of the pleasure of drinking. In Sheridan's St. Patrick's Day the soldier's life is occupied with robbery, fire, murder, and rape. Roebuck thinks that he, like the Prussians, may soon "learn to kill, man, woman, and child." O'Cutter gets into a brawl and street fight, and boasts of having fought seven duels when he was last in Dublin. Macfleer boasts and swaggers in a fashion truly Gargantuan.[3] He cut five thousand throats and got fifty thousand wounds in one brawl. No braggart is his equal for deeds of daring. Compared to his, the boasts of a Pyrgopolinices, Isumbras, Sir Tophas, and other " miles gloriosi" fade into insignificance.

The language these braggarts idulge in is characteristic, and savors of the type found in earlier drama - "I shall break your neck," "provoking scoundrel," "this is hell right, an age of damnation." Likewise epithets applied to these soldiers in

1. "The Lord of the Manor," John Burgoyne, III, iii, 1781.
2. "Love and a Camp," I, i, 1798.
3. "Plot and no Plot," John Dennis, I, i, 1697.

eighteenth century comedy, help to fix the type - "wild -Irish," "bold, boisterous cavalier," etc. Furthermore, the type is designated in the names - Sir Callaghan Brall, Major O'Whack, Major Rakish, Mullinahack, Captain O'Cutter, and others. Even the seemingly innocent name Sir Lucius O'Trigger is cogent with warning.

The Irish soldier is, however, not always, or not wholly, represented as a ruffian and braggart in eighteenth century comedy. After the middle of the century there is a decided reversion of treatment in his favor. The general movements of the time, social and literary, were conductive to a change. The rise of the middle class, the return to nature, the interest in humble man, the growth of liberty and tolerance, the sentimental wave in all literature, religious movements - these made even play-wrights more sympathetic toward their characters. Cumberland, Sheridan, and others now represented the Irishman as a soldier both courageous and self-sacrificing; as a lover with many of the graces of a courtly gentleman; as a man endowed with high ideals. Sir Callaghan writes his proposal to Charlotte's guardian, because he thinks it would not be "consistent with the decoums of a man of honor"[1] to make matrimonial advances to a lady before he had told her guardian. Then he makes his proposal before her other suitors, for he intends "to carry the place like a soldier, à la militaire." He prefers to advance "regularly to the breastworks" before attempting "the covered way." Finally her suitors - Scotch, French, Jew, and English jockey - all desert the lady on finding that she has

1. "Love a la Mode," Charles Macklin, I, i, 1760.

lost her fortune. Callaghan alone remains faithful. He loved her, he says, when she possessed a fortune, with fear and trembling, like a man that loves to be a soldier, yet is afraid of a gun; but now that she is poor, and that it is in his power to serve her, he finds that he "loves her better than when she was rich." In another play Patrick is wounded in trying to save the life of his captain, Fitzroy. Then, although the girl he loved, Novah, preferred him, as he knew, to his more wealthy rival who could, however, keep her in the state she deserved, he was ready to give her up, to "leave her to the good fortune she merits," he said; " 'twould be only love to myself, should I involve her in my indulgences."[1]

O'Flaherty is another unselfish Irish warrior of the late eighteenth century. He is spoken of by another character as a man who "might have married this cousin of mine," and "snapped her whole fortune," if he had not been "the noblest fellow on earth."[2] O'Flaherty simply asks, in turn, where is the nobleness of not being a rascal. He prides himself on the fact that his good name and his good sword are still his own; he has not "mortgaged them to dishonor," and with the grace of Heaven never intends to. Cumberland has his other characters speak well of Major O'Flaherty. Cumberland, in general, depicts his Irishmen as of unusually fine manhood. In The Gentleman's Magazine, we find the statement that O'Flaherty was copied from "the original in the person of Col. O'B---ne, and that this latter was of just such high character."[3]

1. "The Poor Soldier," O'Keefe, II, i, 1798.
2. "The Natural Son," Cumberland, 1785.
3. Vol. LVI.

These same high qualities are found in other Irish characters. Even the roughest soldiers sometimes show real manhood beneath their stern surface. Lieutenant O'Connor distributes money among his soldiers on St. Patrick's Day;[1] and in Love and a Bottle,[2] a cripple calls military officers the most ready to give benefactions. Even the roistering Mullinahack can sympathize with the weak and unfortunate.

A trait common to the Irish people in general, and to the Irish soldier in particular, is humor. The Irish soldier has a humor all his own. His boisterous, masculine associations in camp, the smell of powder, and the ever present danger to which he is subjected, give him a point of view and an attitude to life different from that of people engaged in peaceful pursuits. Accordingly, we may appreciate the statement of Farquhar's "Crippled soldier," "Can't I rob honorably by turning soldier?" he asks; which reechoes merely, "all's honorable in war," a statement that has become cogent enough since 1914. He can understand how an Irish soldier might say to a woman in distress, "I'll divert her sorrow with an account of my own misfortunes." Irish humor is fine in the brusque soldier's speech; "I cant talk fine courtship and love and nonsense like other men; so if you can take up your quarters for life with ... an honest Prussian soldier, now is your time, I am your man."[3] Similarly naive is the statement of O'Connor to his soldiers: "take this, and divide it amongst you. But observe... dont spend six-pence of it for drink;"[4] it sounds rather like a

1. "St. Patricks Day," Sheridan, I, i.
2. Farquhar, I, i.
3. "Love and a Bottle," I, i, 1699.
4. "St. Patrick's Day," Sheridan, I, i, 1775.

father's advice to his son, than the speech of a rough Lieutenant to his soldiers. But the merciful bullet is "more kind than thy ungrateful country" would be appreciated only by those who knew Ireland of the eighteenth century. Such statements are characteristic of the Irish soldier in English comedy of the time, and they mark him as a type distinct. We may, therefore, appreciate the boast of Captain O'Cutter, and his subsequent lament, "When I was last in Dublin I fought one jontleman for cheating me out of a thousand pounds; I fought two of the Mermaid's crew about Sully Macquire; three about politics; and one about the play-house in Smock Alley. But upon my fait, since I am in England, I have done nothing at all, at all." What, however, shall we call the humor of Captain Patrick, who, "like a brave Prussian hero," is "learning to kill man, woman, and child?"[1] The Irish soldier's humor gives us the smell of blood and a touch of the sword's keen edge. It is the laugh of a battle- scarred body, not the smile of a cultivated mind. It comes from hard experience.

These plays are of a distinctly low comedy type. The blustering Irish Captains, Babodil like, strut about in a truly melodramatic fashion. In the presentation of our next Irish type as represented in the seventeenth and eighteenth century English comedy, the hypocrite priest, however, we have an effect almost riotous. Some of the scenes centering on this type character are as boisterous and wild as a mummer's play or morris dance.

1. "Love in Camp," O'Keefe, I,i, 1785.

The character of the hypocrite priest was reprehensible. He had few redeeming features. He was ignorant, superstitous, lazy, bigoted, avaricious, licentious. His impelling motives were power and influence. In The Lancashire Witches and The Amorous Bigot,[1] we find epitomized in Tegue O'Devilly all the faults and vices of Catholic priesthood of the time much exaggerated. Smerk, another character, plays on the ignorance and superstition of Tegue with ludicrous effect. He pretends to be under the spell of witches; so Tegue sets about to exorcise them. As Tegue is about to sprinkle Smerk with holy water, the latter has an accomplice strike the bottle from the priest's hand unseen. "Phaat is de matter now? Phare is dis Devil, dat does taak my Holy-Vater from me?"[2] the Irishman cries. As he reaches for the bottle it flies away again. He recites a monologue of Latin conjuration; then continues, "Bottle, phat vill I do? It is gone." He throws a basin of holy-water into Smerk's face. Mother Demdike, dressed like a witch, gets behind Tegue and beats and kicks him. "Oh," he howls, "oh, vat is dis for, Joy? oh, all my Holy-Vater is gone, I must fly," and the witches beat him off the stage. This ridiculous buffoonery continues at some length. Smerk tells Tegue there is no Purgatory, to which the priest avers that he had "sheen many Shoules of Purgatory," and the souls "did deshire of me that I would pray dem out of that plaashe." He adds that the parents and friends of the souls in purgatory paid him for his services, for "Without money, indeed we cannot pray dem out; no fait."

1. Shadwell, 1682 and 1690 respectively.
2. "The Lancashire Witches," IV, i, 1682.

Still Smerk refuses to believe; so the Priest insists: "Phaat, dosht not believe de Cooncel of Trent, Joy? Dou vilt be damn'd indeed." He calls the Council of Trent infallible and the Cardinals infallible. Constable, another character, thinking himself bewitched because he struck at a hare, comes to Tegue for aid. He declares that he has a great pain in his back, for which Tegue prescribes as follows:-

> "Taak one of de Tooth of a dead Man, and a bee, and burn it, and taak de smoke into both your noses as you take Snuch, and anoint yourself vid de Gaall od a Crow; taak Quicksilver....and put upon a quail, and plaash it under de shoft Pillow you do shit upon; etc."

To this he promises to say some Ave Marias; then the man will be cured. As a remedy for a bewitched cow he suggests putting a pair of Irish trousers on the cow's head on a Friday morning, beat her with a stick until she goes to the witch's door and wraps on it with her horns; then put honey water on the cow's mouth, and she will be cured.[1] This is pure absurdity.

A common fault of the hypocrite priest is avarice. We have already seen how Tegue could not pray souls out of purgatory without being paid for it. Samuel Foote presents the avaricious priest in O'Donnovan.[2] O'Donnovan refuses the money Clack offers him, saying: "Do you main to insult me, don't you know, woman, that we must never touch money?" Clack is about to apologize for her offer when the priest breaks in with, "if, indeed, it was put into a purse, there would be no occasion, d'ye see, for me to touch it" In an altered form of this play, Capuchin, O'Donnovan observes that it was merely a freak of St. Francis to forbid a priest to touch money, the reason beingthat

1. "The Lancashire Witches," IV, i, 1682.
2. "Trip to Calais," Samuel Foote, II, i, 1776.

St. Francis's followers were pick-pockets; but he adds, that now since the "heretics are gone" there is no danger. Hence he "will examine the contents of the purse."

Another avaricious priest is Father Luke, in The Poor Soldier. Dermont asks consent of Father Luke to marry Kathlane.

> Father Luke - "You marry Kathlane, you reprobate?"
> Dermont - "Give her to me, and I'll give your reverence a sheep."
> Father Luke - "Oh, well, I always thought you were a boy that wou'd come to good - a sheep! You shall have Kathlane."[1]

Later the priest decides that he will not marry Kathlane to Dermont, since he wants her himself.

> Dermont - "If that's the case, Father Luke, the two sheep I intended as a present for you, I'll drive to the fair to-morrow."
> Father Luke - (Pausing) "Hey, two sheep! Come back here...Dermont, Child! Isn't it this evening I am to marry you to Kathlane?"[2]

He marries them for the two sheep.

The hypocrite priest is often ambitious for power. We have seen above how Tegue could not refuse money. In The Amorous Bigot, Elvira is forbidden by Tegue to wear patches. She retorts angrily that he "wou'd ha' done great service to the church by being hang'd" for treason. "I do not caare for being hang'd," he replies; "I did deshire to be a cardinal, and by my Shoulwaation I tink I vill be a Cardinal before I vill have Death."[3] In The Lancashire Witches he says he does not care if he is hanged, for he "will be a Saint presently," and all his "country shall pray unto St. Tegue." He believes that he will be a saint since his "Paaper will maake Testification" that his work in England in

1. "The Poor Soldier," - O'Keefe, II, iii, 1798.
2. Ibid.
3. " - Shadwell, I, i, 1690.

reconciling heretics to the church justifies his claim.

The "Testification Paapers" just mentioned show what a consummate hypocrite Shadwell has painted Tegue. Some of the heretics whom he made good Churchmen were thirty-two chambermaids seduced by their masters or master's sons; eighty-two courtisans; eighty-nine burglars, as well as pick-pockets, horse thieves, and murderers in large numbers. These all he made "gallant Catholics, Fait and Trott." He has, however, inducted only two cook-maids into the church, since cook-maids "find de great trouble in dressing de fish." Tegue does not believe that there has been a Popish Plot, but declares that there is a "damn'd Presbyterian Plot to put out de Paapists, and de Priests, and de good Men." He adds that if he had his way he would "shee 'em all broyle and fry" in Smithfield. Later Sir Jeffery compels him to turn Protestant. Tegue thinks this a small matter: "I did taake de Oades, and I am a very good Protestant upon Occasion."

By the way the Irish priest is represented in these comedies, religious adherence is a mere business transaction. Abjuring Catholicism was easy for Tegue. Dispensing his religious doctrine was equally easy for O'Donnovan; he found a "christian kind of bargain" between priests and their people: "they take care of our bodies, and we in return take care of their shouls." That this representation was not all fiction; that it was based on conditions all too true, may be verified by songs and ballads written at the time about the priesthood. One ballad in 1688 entitled <u>Lero lero lili Burlero</u> ridiculed

the Irish priesthood; and Burnet tells us that perhaps never did so slight a thing have so great an effect. Burnet declares that the Papists at this time must have been pure clap-trap.[1] Everybody in the city and country sang the "Lero lero" song, and Mrs. Butler in the Prologue to Lancashire Witches recited these lines:-

> "He d'at is after Hishing in dish plaash,
> I'll shing Lilli - burlero in his faash."

A fault in the Irish priest even worse than his avarice is his licentiousness. His pious pretences in one instance, and his dissolute abandon in another, are noted by the dramatic characters with whom he associates. Elvira calls Tegue her mother's Irish hypocrite. He is not a dispenser of good among the distressed, but a fiendish dispoiler of innocent women. He would have all ladies "dewout indeed;" he loves to "maake a great faath upon dem;" he loves to look upon "de pretty Laady vid pious meditation;" and he loves to reflect "dat Heaven did maake dem so handsom, gra;" then he tries to take unmanly liberties with them.[2] Gremia in Amorous Bigot excuses her occupation, that of keeping a bawdy-house, on the ground that "every Gentleman and Cavalier cannot marry." Tegue concurs with, "Dou shayest vell." She adds that she never misses church, that no man enters her doors "upon Vigil or Fast," and that no woman in Madrid observes Lent and fish-days more strictly. He replies:-

> "I believe dou art a very good Laady, and dosht love de Church; vel Joy, as dou shast, every one cannot marry; and Fornicaation is venial; but vee vil pass by some Piccadillo's, as swearing, Wenching, and Lying, and de like, in dose who love de Church indeed."[3]

1. "Genest," Burnet, Vol. I, p. 477.
2. Shadwell, II, i, 1690.
3. Ibid.

When young Rosina comes to him for confession, he tries to ravish her; and when Bernardo, whom he has allured into a dissolute life, asks that he be married to a lawful wife, Tegue agrees to do so, but says in an aside, that he "vill pronounce de words of de marriage without intention, and den it is no marriage." He adds that this will make Bernardo's children illegitimate. Tegue is, of course, an extreme case of the hypocrite priest, but he holds so prominent a place in the play in which he appears, that he must be considered a type of Irish priesthood.

The servant has been a stock character or type since comedy has been written. In classical comedy he is known for his smart tricks, witty sayings, and sly intrigue. He is really an astute character who gives his master much trouble. In the Italian comedy he still possesses many of the traits of his Roman forebears. In Molière and Beaumarchais the servant is also a shrewd, alert, and scheming personage. When, however, we arrive at English comedy, and the servant class has sunk in the scale, he is usually represented as stupid and bungling. This is especially the case with the Irish servant found in seventeenth and eighteenth century English comedy. He is loquacious; but he is also bungling. If orders are given him, he is sure to get them confused; if secrets are entrusted to him, he reveals them exactly when he is bidden to be most cautious.

A good example of this stupid, bungling, Irish type is Tegue in The Committee.[1] Tegue has lost his master by death; so

1. "The Committee," Robert Howard, I, i, 1665.

he seeks another at the house of Lilly, who lives "at that house, at the end of another House, by the May-pole-house." This intelligence is, of course, not very intelligible. A discussion arises as to whether there are as many stars in Ireland as in England. Tegue declares there are, and more too, and is ready to run to Ireland to see "if the stars be not there still." A book-seller enters crying, "Mercurina Britannicus, or the Weekly Post; or The Solemn League and Covenant." "What is that you say?" Tegue interupts. "Is it the Covenant, have you that?" He demands the covenant to take to his master, and a quarrel ensues, for Tegue refuses to pay for it. "I will knock you down upon the ground, if you will not let me take it," he says, throws down the fellow, and runs off with the prize. In great glee he appears before his master, Colonel Careless, crying, "I have taken the Covenant for thee.... upon my Soul!" This pleases the master, but not the book-seller, who now appears and threatens to put Tegue where he "shall have worse liquor than your Bonny-Clabber." "Bonny-Clabber!" Tegue retorts, "By my Goship's Hand, now you are a Rascal if you do not love Bonny-Clabber." The incident is so odd, and Tegue so earnest, though stupid, that Careless pays the bookseller for the covenant, and tips the bailiff in addition for drink. The situation is silly in all details, but it is a good example of the Irish servant in all his stupidity.

Mrs. Centlivre presents another servant quite as brilliant as that of Mr. Howard.[1] His name is also Tegue. Tegue[2] promises

1. "The Wife Well Managed," Mrs. Centlivre, I, i, 1715.
2. The Name is variously spelled.

Inis that he can carry a message, and do it cunningly too; there need be no fear of his making a mistake. The reward is to be a Moidore, and he must stay for the letter. He thinks, however, that staying for it will not matter, for he has "a very clean letter" in his pocket, which"will do very well" and "save time." Teague is charged to give the letter into no hands but the priest's, and to bring a reply. Above all, Don Pisalto must not see the letter. The servant, however, no sooner has started on his mission than he finds that he has forgotten the priest's name. While he is in this quandry, Don Pisalto enters, reads the address over Teague's shoulder, and discovers his wife's handwriting. He asks Teague who gave him the letter, to which the servant replies: "Arra Maistre, you are very uncivil to inquire into other Folk's Business, so you are." Pisalto threatens to break Teague's head if he will not give up the letter. "Faith won't I," the servant cries, "that's the way to lose the Moidore." Pisalto thinks that business must be very urgent if it costs so much postage, draws his sword, and beats the Irishman until he throws down the missive and curses Pisalto for making him lose his fee. The letter proves to be a confession. Teague begs it that he may deliver it to the priest, lest he lose his Moidore. When, however, the husband offers him two moidores on promise that he will keep secret the discovery, he blurts out with alacrity: "Oh, by my shoul Teague is mum.... Faith, this is a lucky Breaking for poor Teague!" He plans to celebrate the event with drinking St, Patrick's health.

Another example of this type is M'Shuffle. He wants to know what they do at "this shame Univarshity," namely Oxford. He is told that a few unaccountable fellows cultivate the arts and sciences, and study languages. "Do they understand Irish?" he asks. When he is told that they do not, he is offended: "Oh, then the devil burn me, if mine ownshelf or Paddy the chairman in the Pee-a-ches, is not a greater scholar than any of them."[1]

Murtock is another such servant. He is given a check to cash at a bank, but returns without either check or money. When asked what he did with the check, he gives the following account:-

> "Och, faith! and I've been tumbled about bravely! for the people here walk the streets as if they couldn't see, for one parson gave me a drive on one side, and when I only turned to ax him what he had done that for, another gave me a shoulder with his elbow, on the t'other side; so, upon my soul, sir, I was going backward every step I went forward. But, at last, I saw a crowd starting up; so my-self ax'd decently what was the matter - Stop, and luck up, says the man, and you'll see; myself did so, and there was two black pictures of men, with Shillelahs in their fists, thumping at one another because the clock was striking. When it had done, they had done, and I was done; for I found they picked my pocket of the check that I held fast in my hand, and everything I had in the world."[2]

In 1695 the English Parliament abrogated the Oath of Supremacy in Ireland, and substituted the Oath of Abjuration. By this act all men of rank, position, and means had to "abjure the essential doctrine" of the Catholic religion. The Irish Parliament soon after made even more sweeping laws, which compelled Catholics of means to turn Protestant, or to leave Ireland. Many wealthy families fled to England, where they helped to swell

1. "The Oxonian in Town," George Colman, I, i, 1770.
2. "The Irishman in London," William Macready, I, i, 1793.

the medley of foreign immigrants in London and other cities. This gave rise to a type of Irishman who, being without much education but with a certain amount of polish, and being compelled to live among a people whom he found it necessary to ape, may be called the clumsey gallant. Possessed by nature of a certain amount of courtesy and affability, and accustomed to loyalty and obedience from his servants when he was in more fortunate circumstances, he now showed these same admirable qualities in misfortune. The number of these Irish gentlemen was swelled by many Irish military officers, who, after the peace of Ryswick, found themselves without position.

The new type of Irishman in the eighteenth century comedy reflects the change of attitude on the part of English people toward all foreigners,[1] as the romantic age progressed, as interest in humanity grew, and general tolerance spread. Not only did the Irishman now receive more courteous treatment on the stage, but the Jew, the Scotchman, and others did also. Playwrights now began to protest against the treatment Irish characters had received in comedy. Several writers - Kelly, Cumberland, Macklin - deliberately set about to raise the Irishman in the estimation of English theatre audiences. Of course at this time Sentimental Comedy was in vogue; besides, the writers themselves were for the most part Irishmen. In his Preface to <u>The School for Wives</u>,[2] Kelly said that he would "strain every effort to remove from two types of character, the Irishman and the lawyer, those unjust stigmas which a malicious public were constantly

1. See p. 142.
2. 1773.

placing upon them." These dramatists now produced Irishmen of military rank or civil standing who possessed qualities that Englishmen admired: loyalty to England or to their own native land; pride in their ancestry; a high estimation of their own worth; a high sense of honor and honesty; courtesy and gallantry toward women; sympathy for the unfortunate; etc. Cumberland prefaced The West Indian with remarks that he had chosen for this play an Irishman and a West Indian, "two of those suffering characters whom the prejudices of society have usually exhibited as butts, won ridicule and abuse, with the laudable endeavor to reconcile the world to them, and them to the world."[1] He at once made a "hit" with English audiences, to the extent that the play ran twenty-eight nights, an unusual length for that time. The author sold his copy-wright for £150, and the publishers boasted of selling twelve-thousand copies.[2]

We may, then, select O'Flaherty in The West Indian as a good example of the gallant Irishman. O'Flaherty is told that, if he is a good honest man, he will give a certain paper to Dudley. The Irishman replies: "I am a soldier, this is not the livery of a knave; I am an Irishman; mine is not a country to dishonor."[3]

The gallant Irishman appears also in The School for Wives.[4] This Hibernian supports Leeson in his duel with Belville, who has tried to dishonor Leeson's sister. He praises the brother for his manly stand inthe case; yet he hopes to see the day when it will be infamous to draw the sword except against the enemies

1. 1775.
2. Remarks before "The West Indian."
3. IV, ii, 1771.
4. Hugh Kelly, II, ii, 1774.

of England. At another time he declares that he did not imagine a tyrant would be tolerated in England. In thus representing an Irish character with intelligence, judgment, and a sense of honor so high, we can see Kelly's purpose of elevating the Irishman in English eyes.

Another gallant Irishman is O'Connor. He is compelled by Lord Lealand, would-be ravisher of Emily, to row his lordship and Emily, whom Lealand is stealing from her father, across the Thames. On the way he upsets Lealand into the river and rescues the girl. He had found out that Emily "was not a volunteer of her own accord." When praised by her for this act of generosity, he says, "Devil a goodness in the case, honey - "twas no more than the duty of every honest man that is no rogue."[1] A kindly spoken word brought tears to O'Connor's cheeks. He tasted something in his mouth quite brackish, when praised for rescuing Emily; but surely "they could not be tears, sure;" though he is "a menial man of low degree," he is never afraid of doing right.

For an Irishman on the stage to declare his loyalty to England at a time so shortly after many Catholics had been compelled to turn Protestant, to give up their property, or to go into exile, no doubt pleased the audience, and won for the playwright and producer not only favorable comment, but also financial returns in the way of increased door-receipts. But this is just what the Irishman did. Captain Mulinahack tells Miss Bellevue, "First, Madam, it may be necessary to inform you, I'm an Irishman, and a foreign officer; but when I did accept a French commission,

1. "The Maid of Kent," F. G. Waldron, V, i, 1778.

England had no share in the quarrel; for, Madam, let me be blown from the mouth of a cannon, when I turn my face as an enemy against Great Britian, my honor'd country! or my gracious King!"[1]

Macready has presented in Colonel Calloony a true type of Irish gallant. On his return to London from the West Indies, he exclaims, "O London! London! dear London!" London for him is the place for enjoyment, and, if he had it, he would spend millions there. There the "leedies are so bewitching, the squeers so elegant, and everything so captivating."[2] He hopes that he may always live among them. At a reception tendered him, he addresses the entertainers with, "This warm and kind reception is truly flattering, and impresses me strongly with the idea of my future happiness." He is a loyal Irishman, but is willing to admit that Ireland is inferior in some respects to England, a confession, which, no doubt, found ready acceptance in the minds of English theatre audiences.

When Macklin first produced Love à la Mode, there were objections to it on the ground that the author had exalted an Irishman above an Englishman in the play. This, however, "was soon voted down as national prejudice, and English audiences welcomed a stage Irishman who was something other than a cruel caricature of human nature,"[3] says William Archer. We have represented, then, in this type a man with a high sense of his importance; a man of strong democratic spirit, and yet proud of family; a man with a certain amount of conceit and affectation, yet eager to stand high in the respect of his superiors.

1. "The World is a Village," O'Keefe,V,i, 1793.
2. "The Irishman in London," I, i, 1793.
3. "Eminent Actors," William Archer, Pt. III, p. 138.

Yet too much praise seems more than some Irish gallants could stand. The efforts of Kelly and others to exalt their countrymen on the stage seem to have turned the heads of their creations - of some of them. Hence sentiment late in the century again swung against this type. Count Connolley Villars is a colonel in an Irish brigade, whose pride is excessive. Another character says of him: "He trates his inferiors with contempt, keeps his distance with his equals, and values the rubbishing dust of his great grandfathers above diamonds."[1] A woman in the play calls him an "Irish-French fortune-hunter....half Franch, half Irish."

The sentimental Irishman is a type that grew out of the gallant Irishman. The relationship was close. O'Whack is a proud Hiberian valet who sputters French, curls hair, courts the ladies, takes snuff, and in general is sentimental as a French fop. His speech is half French, half English: "The colonel will be here dans une moment;" "If my master hadn't l'argent enough of his own, he wouldn't be after tazing his old guardian," etc.[2]

Another good example of the sentimental Irishman is represented in Murloch. This character comes upon the stage singing: -

> "We Irishmen, both high and low, we are both neat and handy,
> The ladies everywhere we go, allows we are the dandy,"

To this he adds his own sentiments: "To be sure we are, and indeed[3]

1. "School for Arrogance," - Holcroft, I, i, 1791.
2. "Notoriety," Frederick Reynolds, II, i, 1792.
3. "The Irishman in London," William Macready, II, i, 1799.

we are." It is interesting to note that, when his master, Calloony, calls Murtoch, "Dill," Murtoch protests: "Myself can't bear it; it makes so little of one."

The sentimentality of this type carries with it much, however, that is praiseworthy. The spirit of devotion in Brian O'Brady is quite beautiful. O'Brady finds a lost child desolate and starving, along a river. He takes the child home and provides for her. "She is very ill for a long time," he tells us, but lived to be the blessing of his old age. For this act one character, Ardent, calls him a prince; another Ardmore, calls him "worthy, benevolent, good-hearted fellow." Eliza herself tells us that for seventeen years he has been a father to her. O'Brien pities Eliza for needing to work too hard; and when she lacks the quality of food he cannot provide for her, he thinks of himself as a scoundrel. His Irish humor, however, asserts itself even in sorrow. So he tells usthat if "any geese, turkeys, lambs, or any other poultry, nay if the Lincolnshire ox, or even the big dun cow herself, was to come my way, she'd be dead as mutton before she could say trapstick."[1] Then he reverts to the sentinmental. On the table is a leg of lamb which the Irishman laments over. "Och! Mr. O'Brian O'Bradley! and that's myself:- an't you ashamed to look yourself in the face ... to let that ugly thief of a butcher murder your own poor little, innocent, good-looking, sweet, beautiful, fat lamb! But yesterday I shared my crust with him and to-day - O'Brian!! O'Brian! you murderer of innocents, I shall never like you again! Your character's gone to

1. "Heart of Oak," J. T. Allingham, V, ii, 1804.

the devil." Then he tells how the lamb had skipped before his door, danced jigs and hornpipes to divert him, and yet had to meet a fate like this. O'Brian has purchased a chain and locket for Eliza's neck. When he presents it to her, he remarks that she "shall kiss it and cry over it:" and he adds, "I'll cry along with you, and we'll both cry to-gether and be as miserable and unhappy as most unreasonable people."

Several other instances of the sentimental Irishman occur which may be grouped as of less importance. O'Flaherty is an Irishman much like O'Brian. He chides Belcous and Charles for fighting a duel over Louisa, saying that they have "done a notable thing ... to put her into such a flurry."[1] O'Flannagan, another example, hopes that he is better bred than to mention anything of his private affairs before ladies.[2] O'Curragh, having contrived to carry the "queen" to safety, and fearing for her comfort, exclaims: "Oh! to die for such a lady, and such a master, is what no faithful servant would ever repent of!"[3] Finally there is O'Bubble, who finds Old Wiggens trying to take money from a woman, and compels him to get down on his knees and beg pardon "for having insulted a lady who is under my protection." Then he turns to the woman and exclaims, "bless your dear heart! Bless my soul you are an angel in Guad!"[4]

1. "The West Indian," - Cumberland, IV, v, 1771.
2. "Cozeners," - Foote, I, i, 1774.
3. "Zorinski," - Morton, II, iii, 1795.
4. "Mrs. Wiggins," - Allingham, II, iv, 1803.

The Bluff Humorist.

Our interest in a stage character is, usually, in what he says, even more than in how he says it. How a character expresses himself, however, is necessary to provide tone, atmosphere, and local color. We have long associated certain traits, mannerisms, and idiosyncrasies with certain nationalities; the Irishman is one of these nationalities. What the Irish character on the stage says, and the native, inimitable way in which he says it, have added a sprightliness and a human interest which only the Hibernian temperament can offer. We expect the Irishman to distort ideas; to flash them upon us in a form unusual. He is a man from whom we do not expect the conventional. From him the unexpected is the expected.

The Irishman's chief penchant is a play on words; an indulgence in puns, and those strange verbal surprises - "Bulls;" unexpected analogies; startling exaggerations; keen wit; subtle satire. His statements connote rather than denote; they do not express ideas long associated with a given group of words, but convey more meaning or less meaning. The Irishman loves innuendo, and he loves hyperbole.

The pun and the play on words are always present in the dialogues of Irish characters. When a man is said to have gone to the Devil, this dread name may prove to apply to no worse a place than the "Devil Tavern."[1] The catching of a man's arm from

1. "The Committee," Robert Howard, III, i, 1665.

behind and taking his sword may raise the protest, "thish ish the besht quard upon the rules of fighting, to catch a man behind his back."[1] Or a man's habit of punning may approach the "counter-check quarrelsome" like the following: When Subtleman asks Teague what he is sitting on, the Irishman replies, "Nothing, dear joy." "Nothing?" Subtleman asks, "Is it not a portmantle?" And Teague flashes back, "that is nothing to you."[2]

Better than puns, however, are the Irish "Bulls" found in eighteenth century English comedy. Teague tells us that Macfadin went over with King James into France, and that he himself was servant of Macfadin; then he adds in an aside, "Dere ish de true lee noo."[3] Again, Teague complains that he has no possessions in the world "but thish poor portmantle, and dat itshelf is not my own."[4] O'Flaherty cannot refuse a favor to Miss Rusport, for, he avers, "though it may not be in my power to do the favour you ask, look you, it can never be in my heart to refuse it."[5] Connolly finds that "pleasure in the extreme is certainly a painful thing;" or he thinks that "nobody's eye looks half so well as when it is disfigured by a tear of humanity."[6] O'Whach is all ready to receive his master "à la mode de Français, as we say in Ireland."[7] And Armagh admits that he is a native of Ireland, and supports the assertion with the reason "I was born there."

Whimsicalities bordering on the "Bull" are common in these

1. "Twin Rivals," - Farquhar, V, iv, 1702.
2. Ibid., III, ii, 1702.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. "The West Indian," - Cumberland, IV, vii, 1771.
6. "School for Wives," Hugh Kelly, IV, v, 1773.
7. "Notoriety," Frederick Reynolds, II, i, 1792.

plays. Connolly holds that it would not do to have his master bound over to keep the peace; it would indeed be a "shameful thing for a gentleman to keep the peace."[1] But Connolly does find a way to obtain harmony. He says: "If I was in the general's place I would devide the house with his devil (General's wife); I would keep within doors myself, and make her take the outside."[2] If "Painter" was not well versed in art, he none-the-less possessed wit. He tells how he painted the sign of the setting sun for a linen draper in Dublin. "Devil burn me," he remarks, "but the Auroree of O'Guide was a fool to it." "The Architect" corrects him: "O'Guide! .... Guido, I suppose you mean." The Irishman replies, that if there is an "O" in his name, what signifies whether if come before or behind; and adds, "I put it like my own of O'Daub, on the right side, to make it sound more like a gentleman."[3] O'Curragh is interesting for his witticisms. He asks Amalekite, the Jew, "Pray, Jew is your Christian name Amalekite?" He wishes to indulge the Jew with a return of civility; so he bows low. When, however, Amalekite does not respond in the same manner, he adds tartly: "I suppose, like other great men, you have stooped so low to get there, that your back has been cramped ever since." He also advisesthe Jew to be "secret, snug-dumb as a potato."[4]

There is something pathetic in the humorous remarks sometimes expressed by Irish characters in these comedies. We see

1. "School for Wives," III, vi, 1773.
2. Ibid.
3. "The Maid of Oaks," - Burgoyne, I, i,1774.
4. "Zorinski, " Thomas Morton, I, ii, 1795.

through it a background of poverty and suffering which reveal a sad heart beneath the genial and jovial surface. "If you are hungry, there's something for you to ate (Aside - if I had anything), and pray drink with me; for if it's only water, you are heartily welcome. What signifies the expense when you are a little genteel." This speaks "O'B --- " in Heart of Oak.[1]

Analogies of similitudes drawn by Irish characters are full of humor. O'Bradleigh takes out his tobacco box and asks Ardent whether he knows himself to be very much like that "little quid of bachy." "When I put it into my mouth," he continues, "it's very hot and bitter and bites my tongue; but when it has been there a little while, it's mighty pleasant and agreeable: and You'll be very pleasant and agreeable when I have talked to you a little, for all you are so cross and snappish at present."[2]

A study of the names of Irish characters in eighteenth century comedy has an interest. The fact that many of the playwrights who created these Irish personae were themselves Irish, shows more of the naive Irish personality. We have such names as O'Daub, O'Whack, O'Curagh, O'Flaherty, O'Divilly, Mullinahack, and a whole catalogue of othersof a similar nature. O'Brallaghan rolls off a whole string of Ibernian words which compose his name alone - Shemus Thurlough Shannaghan O'Brallaghan. The names commonly also designate the character of the persons possessing them. Thus O'Daub was what his name signified, rather than a real artist; O'Whack was a blustering ruffian; O'Sharper carried "away all the Fortunes;" while O'Divilly beat the devil himself at mischief.

1. J. T. Allingham, II, iv, 1804.
2. "Hearts of Oak," J. T. Allingham, II, ii, 1804.

The bluff humorist was a real humorist, for he saw not only the faults and foibles of mankind, but he could also sympathize with such weaknesses. He was really interested in humanity; he was usually ready to give relief when it was anywhere needed. This is true particularly in the case of characters created by Irish play-wrights, such as Garrick, Macklin, and Sheridan. There is, moreover, a gaiety, a comicality, in the way our Irish character sympathizes; it shows a sort of archness or slyness, as if to say "I have felt the same," or "I have been in the same straits." We understand Sir Callaghan, then, when he says that he loved Charlotte while she had a fortune of £100,000, but it was with fear and trembling; now, however, since she had lost her wealth, he loved her better than when she was rich.[1] To have "enough to maintain a couple of honest hearts, and have something to spare for the necessities of a friend," he declares is all he wants, or all that fortune is good for.

This ability of getting into the experience of others is found in Garrick as well as in Macklin. It took an Irishman to represent an Irishman. The widow Brady in her new garments expects "to forget the sorrows of Mrs. Brady in the joys of Mrs. Whittol,"[2] and though she has no fortune herself, she remarks "I shall bring a tolerable one to you, in debts, Mr. Whittol." But she promises to pay her new husband "tinfold in tenderness," for, she observes, "Your deep purse, and my open heart will make us the envy of the little grate ones, and the grate little ones." The Widow was

1. "Love a la Mode," Charles Macklin, II, i, 1793.
2. "The Irish Widow," David Garrick, I, iii, 1772.

obliged to mourn for her first husband, that she might be sure of a second; for, she says, her father kept her spirits in subjection as the best recipe for changing a widow into a wife." Now, however, that she has "got rid of" her father, she "must and will" have her swing. She now feels like dancing "two nights together and a day, too, like any singing bird."

We should not fail to notice that the bluff humorist is often pretty largely bluff. O'Neale considers it an affront to carry a letter for Whittle; hence, if he finds anything in the letter that he cannot understand, either Whittle will "let out the noble blood" of O'Neale, or he will "spill the last drop of red puddle of the Whizzle (Whittle). He commands Whittle not to stir till he returns, and not to "ate, drink, or sleep" till his own honor is satisfied. It were better, he avers, that Whittle "fast a year and die in six months, than dare to lave," his house. Then he suddenly adds, "So now Mr. Wheezle, you are to do as you plase."[1] This is Irish bluff and banter, but it is kindly bluff.

Speaking of Love à la Mode,[2] Professor William Archer says the following: -

> "The quarrel between Sir Archy, with his abominable Scot's accent, and his grotesque visage almost burried in snuff, and the bold boisterous cavalier Sir Callaghan, on the antiquity of their respective families, is almost worthy of Sheridan."[3]

This dialogue of Archy and Callaghan illustrates well the bluff humorous spirit of the Irishman. Sir Callaghan tells how, on his father's side, he is related to the O'Flaherty's, and O'Shanghnesses, and the Mac Lauchlins, and the O'Donnaghans, O'Callaghans,

1. "The Irish Widow," David Garrick, II, i , 1772.
2. Macklin, 1793.
3. "Eminent Actors," Pt. III, p. 135.

O'Geogaghans, and "all the tick blood of the nation." But Sir Archy Mac Sarcasm takes issue with him. "Ye o'Ireland," he holds, "are but a colony frae us, an ootcast!" Callaghan retorts in kind. He holds that since Shemus Thurlough Shannaghan O'Brallaghan wrote in his chapter of genealogy that "the Scotch are all Irish bastards,"[1] it must be true, for this historian was an Irish poet of his own family.

The strange bluff humor of the Irishman is further illustrated in O'Currogh; when the haughty Jew is finally made to serve O'Currogh, and prostrates himself before his master, the Irishman says: "Oh! we shall have such jolly doings: every heart will wear the face of joy, and all countenances, men, women, cows, Jews, and sheep, must be on the brood grin." His slaves now all prostrate themselves before O'Currogh and he continues: "Thank you, thank you, thank you! ---- What are you at? What are you at, jewels? Keep your fore-paws off the ground, and don't make bulls of yourselves."[2]

Play-wrights create many humorous situations by having Irish characters make bargains of various kinds. Connolly is a large man physically, but does not have a large bank account. The Bailiff asks him, "Can you swear yourself worth £170 when your debts are paid?" He cannot, nor 170 pence, unless he "has a mind to purjure" himself. But he thinks that one man's body is as good as another's; and, since hismaster has no bail to give except his flesh, "the fattest of us two is the best security." This is not very subtle humor, but it is the kind that seemed to

1. "Love a la Mode," - Macklin, I, i, 1793.
2. "Zorinski," thomas Morton, I, ii, 1795.

please English audiences of the time.

A better illustration is found in Sir Patrick O'Neale. Sir Patrick gets great pleasure from the fact that an "old jontleman" of property will have the honor of being united with the family of the O'Neals; for, he notes, "we have been too much jontlemen not to spend our estate, as you have made yourself a kind of jontleman by getting one."[1]

Owen Mac Ogle is a bluff humorist who has his own way of making bargains. He writes Sir Gilbert Wrangle a letter announcing his own and his brother's coming to consummate marriages with Sir Gilbert's daughters. The brothers have never met their fiancées-to-be, but that does not matter; they saw the young ladies once at a cathedral, and fine they "vil sharve" well enough. The suitors are coming "with a loving design to put our families upon one anoder," and if the Irishmen have decided on such a union, of course there can be no dissenting from it on the part of the father and daughters. So they "vil taak dem vidout never a penny of money," to show their "sincere affections;" but merely as a "token of Shivility" on the father's part, each desires "the faavour of ten thousand." Now it happened, moreover, that in their haste they forgot some of their clothes and bills of exchange; so they beg that Sir Gilbert "be so grateful" as to send them two score pounds to put "into some worship for the mean time," that was all.[2] This is, of course, fantastical exaggeration; it is, however, humor as the Irishman saw it, for Colley Cibber was himself an Irishman.

1. "The Irish Widow," - Garrick, II, i, 1772.
2. "The Refusal," Colley Cibber, I, i, 1721.

I cannot close this discussion of the Irishman as represented in eighteenth century comedy better than by quoting from Macready: -

> "The eccentricities of Pat have not been behind hand in contributing their full share to the gayety of nations, and, while we have laughed heartily at his careless humour, his queer-sounding compound epithets, his antipodean association of thunder and turf, and such-like comical amalgamations of elementary and vegetable matter, some kind-hearted trait, some dash of genuine feeling, has suddenly come across us, and made us long to take him by the hand and claim acquaintance, even though we should perceive the peculiar token with which St. Patrick is wont to greet his particular friends - 'From his sprig of shillelah and shamrock so green.'"[1]

1. "Remarks," or Introduction to the "Irishman in London," 1793.

Other Foreign Types in English Comedy.

Among other types, the Scotch are perhaps most important. In the treatment of Scotch types, it is interesting to note that the play-wrights did not present one really good Scotchman. They represented Irishmen of low, disreputable character; but they also represented Irishmen who were in all respects praiseworthy. They painted some Frenchmen as unworthy; but they also found many deserving of high commendation. Among the Scotch, on the other hand, no male character, (and few female), was represented in a favorable light. As early as 1652 John Tatham showed great detestation for Scotchmen, and drew their character in contemptuous colors.[1] Even writers late in the eighteenth century scored theScotch. Macready called them proud and pursy;[2] Macklin disliked their abominable accent and their "grotesque visage almost buried in snuff."[3]

Three types of Scotchmen stand out quite distinctly - the saucy, knavish servant; the cunning, avaricious business man; and the pertinacious egoist.

Not many Scotch servants are represented. The outstanding ones are "Sawney," of John Lacy's Sauny the Scot;[4] "Wullie," of David Craufurd's Courtship a la Mode;[5] and "Gibby,"

1. "The Scots Figaries," cf. Baker - Biographia Dramatica, p. 250.
2. Introduction on the "Irishman in London," 1793.
3. "Love a la Mode," I, i, 1793.
4. 1698.
5. 1700.

of Mrs. Centlivre's The Wonder.[1] Sawney is a saucy, impudent rascal, whose language and manners belong to the alehouse or brothel. His personal appearance is unkempt. "Why don't you get yourself cured of the mange?" his master asks him, to which he replies that he would not be cured for a thousand pounds, for "there's nea a lad in Scotland but loves it." He would hang himself, he says, if it was not for "scratten and scrubben." To Margaret who tells him she cannot bear his master's, Petruchio's, face, because it is so ugly, he repliesin words that do not bear publishing; to his master who bade him bring certain other servants to the park, he pleads being too hungry, and adds, "Deliver your message yourself." When Margaret is famishing for lack of food, Sawney tantalizes her with suggesting all kinds of delicious dishes, but refuses to bring her any of them. Margaret complains of the tooth-ache; so Sawney offers to fetch a dentist "to pull her head off," and turns to Petruchio with "Cud ye not mistake and draw her tang instead of her teeth?"[2]

Wullie is a saucy rogue of the same stamp. Freelove bids him "come along, sirrah;" he responds with, "Sirrau me nea sirraus. The minister bauptized me Wullie Beetlehead, a Scotlaund-Man." Freelove, his master, instructs him on what a competent servant should be. He enumerates three things, - "keep a due distance, speak little, and hear much." He retorts angrily, "waud ye learn an Gentleman good manners?" He is very proud of his nationality: "The Waulsh aun Irish aur neathing tea us for quality." Some of his language in his reference to

1. 1714.
2. "Sauny the Scot," II, i, 1698.

women is quite as low as that of Sawney. He is very worldly wise; he advises Freelove against marrying for money, for a woman who claims to have £10,000 perhaps has no £200, and adds "An English womaun will trust her person whaur she wonna trust her purse."[1]

Gibby is no better than his compatriots. To a soldier who asks him a civil question he blurts out: "The de'el pike out yer e'en, and then ye'el see the better, ye portigeese tike." The soldier does not yet understand; so Gibby threatens to "crack his scroon" if he says more. Then he trips up the soldier's heels. Gibby is a sort of go-between to Colonel Briton in this play. He aids in entangling the plot by his intrigues, and is a considerable swaggerer and bully in addition.[2]

In The Man of the World,[3] Macklin still treated the Scotchman in an unfavorable light. There was some criticism of the author for this on the ground that it was a national reflection. The Biographia Dramatica thinks this "being too fastidious."[4] However, that may be, the fact that different play-wrights represented Scotchmen within a class in much the same way, shows that these characters had sufficient traits in common to make them typical. Stephen Jones, in the Biographia Dramatica brought down to 1811, shows that cunningness is a Scotch trait; he adds that a Scotchman would lose "half his cunningness without his bur."[5] In The Man of the World, Macklin calls one of his principal characters Sir Pertinax Mac Sycophant. We learn that he is a "true-born Scotchman," and his name is Pertinax, the pertinacious. In speaking of another character of Macklin's Sir Archy

1. "Courtship a la Mode," David Craufurd, III, i, 1700.
2. "The Wonder! A Woman Keeps a Secret," Mrs. Centlivre, III, iii, 1714. 3. 1781. 4. IV, p. 17.
5. "Biographia Dramatica," Stephen Jones, Vol. IV, p. 17.

Mac Sarcasm, William Archer, observes that he is a caricature of the same character- the cunning, avaricious Scotchman.[1] Colonel Briton in The Wonder gives hisreason for the existence of this type. He declares that "the kirk half starves" them at home, and so, when they go abroad, they "feed like cannibals."[2]

Money is the object of these grasping adventurers. Sir Pertinax wants to know where he may look for a wife with "siller." It matters not who the woman is, or how unattractive; if she has money, Sir Pertinax will marry her. If she is old, so much the better; he may then soon have her property. Accordingly, Sir Pertinax did not go to court or the theatre assemblies to find a wife, we are told; but he went to the kirk, the pious assembly of old women, where he "fell upon an old, slighted, antiquated, musty maiden." She looked "just like a skeleton in a surgeon's glass case." But as soon as he "found she had siller," he plunged himself "down close by her cheek by jowl - and prayed, and sighed, and sung, and groaned." He got most religiously intimate with her in a week, married her in a fortnight, buried her in a month, "touched the siller, and with a deep suit of mourning, and a melancholy port, a sorrowful visage, and a joyful heart," he began his adventures over again.

Sir Archy Mac Sarcasm reveals his own character, and shows the attitude of his type when he says: "O, Sir, ye dinna ken the law - the law is a sort of hocus pocus science that smiles in yeer face, while it picks yeer pocket."[3] He proceeds at once to put his theory into effect by his hypocritical treatment of

1. "Eminent actors," William Archer, Pt. III, p. 134.
2. "Mrs. Centlivre," I, i, 1714.
3. "Love à la Mode," - Macklin, II, i, 1793.

Charlotte. He makes effusive promises of faithfullness to her if she will marry him. She relies on his promises. Soon, however, it transpires that she loses her fortune. At once Sir Archy disavows his pledge of "friendship, honor, and eternal love"; his vows proved mere "idle breath and deceitful ceremony." When she confronts him with his perfidy, he protests against "taminating the blood o' Mac Sarcasm wi ony thing sprung frae a hogs-head, or a country house." Later he learns that Charlotte did not, after all, lose her fortune; then he again changes front and renews his wooing. Thus his own acts proved to be no more than smiling into the young woman's face while he plotted to pick her pockets.

Another cunning avaricious Scotchman appears in The Englishman Returned from Paris.[1] Macruthen is made guardian of a young heir, whom he tries to swindle out of his patrimony. This Scotchman has little part in the play, and is, therefore, important merely as an example of this Scotch type.

A better example of the type is Captain Dash, in The Highland Reel,[2] who tries to persuade Sergeant Jack to recruit a hundred men for the East Indian service. The whole scheme is a swindle, and Jack protests. But the "Imposition can't be easily detected," Dash maintains. The two men gain their ends through vain promises and flattery, ship the troops out of the country, and appropriate the spoils.

The pertinacious egotist is another of the Scotch types. This man can do anything, and knows everything. Examples of the

1. Samuel Foote, I, i, 1756.
2. - O'Keefe, I, iii, 1788.

type are found in "Willie," in a play, Courtship Alamode,[1] by Cranfurd; Colman in Occasional Prelude[2] attributes the same characteristic to the Scotch; and Macready in The Irishman in London, observes that the Scotchman was "too proud and too pursy to creep in at the cranny whence his leanness originally crept out."[3]

The best example of this type is found in The Apprentice. This character, called "Scotchman," aspires to the stage. He knows that he can act "Macbeth." When "Irishman" tells him his Scotch accent is an impediment, he retorts: "Impeediment! What impeediment? I do not leesp, do I? I do not squeent - I am well leerned, am I not?" So he addresses the members of the Spouting Club: "Come, now, I'll gee you a touch of Macbeeth!" He has acted in the Reegiceede Club in Edinburgh, why not in the Spouting Club in London. "Only stay," he bids, he hear a "specimen of elocution."[4] And then, for some lines "Scotchman" and "Irishman" edify one another.

1. 1700.
2. 1776.
3. 1793.
4. Arthur Murphy, II, i, 1756.

The Italian Types.

It was a common practice of play-wrights to give to certain plays foreign settings, and to their characters corresponding foreign names. The countries thus chosen are Spain and Italy. In such instances, however, the characters will, in all respects, except names, be English; they will speak English, they will express opinions purely English, and they will act like Englishmen. Even when some person in a play does speak in Italian or Spanish, the plain Englishman can easily be seen through the mask. Among the plays that illustrate this practice are Crowne's City Palitiques,[1] Behn's The Town Fop,[2] and Feign'd Courtezans.[3] In such plays we may have Italian castles, forests, banditti, and Italian names, but not one word of Italian, or even of Italianate English.

Enthusiasm for Italy is a notable quality in these comedies. Characters speak of having been in Italy, of her wonderful cities, of her artistic atmosphere, and of the cultivated people. All this suggests a resurrection of the "Italianated Englishman" of Elizabethan times. Mirabell calls Italy "the garden of the world." The many cities of Italy are "all fine." Her customs, gardens, buildings, paintings, music make her "the paradise of the world."[4] Colman's Musical Lady

1. John Crowne, 1675.
2. Aphra Behn, 1677.
3. Ibid., 1679.
4. "The Inconstant," George Farquhar, I, ii, 1702.

idolizes the Italian language,[1] and Cumberland speaks of Italy as "the paradise of the earth, the epicure's heaven."[2] Young men are spoken of as traveling in Italy; some go there to study.

The Italian types in eighteenth century English comedy are really Italianated Englishmen, not Italian immigrants in England. They, however, assume Italian airs and manners to such a degree that we may classify them under Italian types. Among these particularly prominent is "The Virtuoso." Sophy speaks of George having associated with "all the virtuosi of Italy,"and therefore must "abominate filthy English and idolize dear Italian."[3] She herself wishes to acquire the Italian style and to lose "the horrid English cadence." In the Epilogue to this play Colman speaks of the Italians as the "tuneful race." In another play Colman employs Italian and English singers. The Italian singer sweeps over the stage on the wings of an eagle, whereas the English woman singer is "fix'd to one spot, with her arms pinioned and skewer'd to her sides."[4] The object is, obviously, to show that English actors lack art, are mere posts. In another play the Virtuoso, Manlove, visited the principal cities of Italy; then he settled at "Rome as the repository of the antiques."[5] Here he studied philosophy. The Virtuoso is, however, usually a musician. Thus Doricourt goes to Italy "where the sole business of people is to study and improve the powers of Music." These people yield to the fascination of the "charming

1. II, i, 1762.
2. "The Observer," Richard Cumberland, Vol. III, No . 65, p. 45, 1791.
3. "The Musical Lady," George Colman, II, i, 1762.
4. "Occasional Prelude," I, i, 1772.
5. "The Choleric Man," - Cumberland, II, v, 1775.

science."[1] In The Election Joanna Baillie tells us that a mark of refinement in a person is supposed to be to sing in Italian and play upon the harp.[2] The Italian painter is also a member of the Virtuosi, but he is not so common in these comedies as is the musician.

The Italianated courtly gentleman forms another type of comedy characters at this time. English travellers aped the speech and manners of courtly Italians much as they had aped those of the French earlier in the century. In fact, we have examples of such imitating even when the Frenchman was still the cynosure of young English gallants. "Sir Signal, you are grown a perfect Italian," says Galliard in The Feign'd Courtezan; and turns to another character: "Well, Mr. Tickletext, you will carry him home a perfect gentleman."[3] It is "L'air enjouie" the indescribable something that one feels in the restless charms of Italy and France," that Doricourt, longs for. He declares that he has known an Italian Marquizina make ten conquests in stepping from her carriage.[4]

This courtliness was not agreeable to all Englishmen, however. In The Observer we learn that Italy, "the epicure's heaven" makes a young man kiss his hand like an age, cringe his neck like a starveling, and play at Hey-pass-repass-come aloft, when he salutes a man."[5] Such a man becomes an excellent courtier, "a curious carpet-knight," the play tells us. The courtly Italianated Englishman seems to have remained a fairly constant and fixed type, though some Italian characters are represented as rather unattractive, as we shall see.

1. "The Belle's Stratagem," I, ii, 1781.
2. II, iii, 1802.
3. Aphra Behn, I, ii, 1679.
4. "The Belle's Stratagem," I, ii, 1780.
5. - Cumberland, Vol. III, No. 65, p. 45, 1785.

The Treacherous Villain.

In his treatise on Comedy Meredith has this to say about the Italian comedy: "Priestly arrogance and unctuousness and trickeries and casuistries, cannot be painted without our discovering a likeness in the long Italian gallery." Thus Meredith found that the Italian as represented in English comedy is sometimes a treacherous villain. It marks him as a type. Aphra Behn speaks of an Italian as "in Punctellio's of honorable Revenge," and classifies Italian characters from different cities as follows: a Venetian will betray you for money; a Millanoise is fit only for highway robbery; a Genoaess will "sooner kill by usury than sword or pistol;" a Roman is fit only as a spy.[1] Intrigue, robbery, and murder are the qualities attributed to the Italian - a consummate villain. In The Town Fop, Sham tells Sir Timothy Tawdry that he need not fear having his throat cut, for the English "have none of that Italian Humour now-a-days."[2] Treachery is a trait common to the Italian as found in Behn, Cumberland, and other play-wrights. Poisoning is the method employed by many of these villains. So in "The Universal Passion" the jealous Byron wishes that the cook who dressed the wedding dinner were of the "true Italian spirit."[3] As early as 1675 we find the Italian represented as so depraved

1. "The Amorous Prince," V, i, 1671.
2. "The Town Fop," A. Behn, V, i, 1677.
3. "Universal Passion, James Miller, I, i, 1737.

that one shudders at his acts;[1] as late as 1791 Cumberland called the Italian courtly, but treacherous, versed in the art of poisoning, treachery, and hypocrisy.[2]

1. "City Politicks," J. Crowne, 1675.
2. "The Observer," Vol. III, p. 45, No. 65.

The Spanish Types.

Next, after the Frenchman and the Irishman, the Spaniard appears most frequently in eighteenth century comedy. In some plays, however, not more than the setting and one or more characters are Spanish or have Spanish names; in others, the setting is English, but one or more of the characters is Spanish. Usually the part played by a Spanish character is small. Sometimes the plays are mere adaptations of Spanish plays, as, for instance The Spanish Barber[1] taken from the Barbier de Seville of Beaumarchais. Sometimes incidents, characters like the Bandetti, or elements like the picaresque give the play a Spanish atmosphere, but the speeches are all in English, as in The Castle Audalusia.[2] Many of the plays are English in every respect except the Spanish names of certain characters.

In the treatment of the Spanish types, we naturally expect the rogue or picaroon to bear a prominent part, for he is a prevailing type in the novel of the time; this he does in the eighteenth century English comedy. In fact, the picaroon is almost the only type of Spanish character represented. "That same book will teach you to play a trump upon death, and show yourself a match for the devil" says Sancho to Clarino in Love Makes the Man.[3] Such is the language spoken by Spanish dramatis personae in eighteenth century plays; and such is the spirit of

1. "The Spanish Barber," George Coleman, 1777.
2. "The Castle Audalusia," - O'Keefe, 1782.
3. "Love Makes the Man," Colley Cibber, I, i, 1701.

the men speaking. The action is picaresque. In the above play by Cibber, Carlos and Don Lewis are set upon in Lisbon by Bravoes, are injured, gagged, and carried away. Carlos has a duel in which he stabs Don Duart, whereas Carlos, Lewis, and a woman character, Angelina, are captured by Spanish pirates.

These plays are usually built on revenge plots. Jealousy is the common motive for revenge. Aphra Behn tells us that the Spaniards are a nation given to jealousy; that jealousy will deprive a Spaniard of his senses, and "turn his nature Brute."[1] Love intrigues are usually at the bottom of the revenge plots; the instrument of vengeance is the poinard. "I heard you and that bloody minded Spaniard threaten what you'd do to this gentleman, if you catch'd him in your house" is characteristic.[2] Intrigues, jealousy, and revenge mark these Spanish-rogue plays.

Among the most representative plays that present the Spaniard during the eighteenth century are these: Cibber's <u>She Would and She Would Not</u> (1703); Centlivre's <u>The Platonic Lady</u> (1707); Durfey's <u>The Old Mode and New</u> (1709); and Charles Johnson's <u>The Wife's Relief</u> (1710). The atmosphere throughout these plays is filled with roguery: such as, "Here's a Rogue for your Death" (The Old Mode and New - Durfey, II, i); "Oh damn'd Rogue" (Ibid); "A match for the devil" (Love Makes the Man - Cibber, I, i); "Damned heathen dogs" (Doctor and Apothecary - Joseph Cobb, II, i); "Poison your Wife and marry the young Sinner" (The Wife's Relief - Charles Johnson, V, i).

1. "The False Count," I, ii, 1682.
2. "Marplot," Mrs. Centlivre, V, i, 1711.

Jealousy as emphasized through these plays appears so constantly as almost to become proverbial of Spanish characters: "the Humour of Jealousy even outdoing the most rigid of us Spaniard;"[1] "he's as jealous as a Spaniard." (Bickerstaff's Burying, - Centlivre, I, i, 1719); "though by no means infected with Spanish jealousy" (The Double Mistake - Mrs. Griffith, I, i, 1766). The action in these plays is based not so much on what the rogue actually does, as on what he threatens to do, or on his power to do harm. The English thought of the Spaniard as their forebears did in the sixteenth century, that he was a rogue, a pirate, and a cut throat; they seem unwilling to give the Spaniard credit for generous impulses or high motives.

We may find another type of the Spaniard in the profligate. The English play-wrights of the century looked upon the Castilian as a roué. In his attitude to men he was portrayed as a cut-throat; in his attitude to women, as a dispoiler. In Love Makes the Man, Clodio boasts of spending the night in drink and in the arms of six wives and daughters. Cibber describes how Clodio closed the orgy: "about eight O'clock the next day, slap they all soused upon their knees; kissed round; burned their commodes, drank my health, broke their glasses, and so parted."[2] In The Busy Body, a Spanish character, Sir Jealous Traffick, considers it the height of impudence for English women to be seen in public un-veiled, and "scarce belives there's a true begotten child in the city."[3]

1. "The False Count," - Behn, I, i, 1682.
2. "Love Makes the Man," I, i, 1701.
3. "Mrs. Centlivre," I, i, 1709.

In Money the Mistress a Spanish character, Manuel, is surprised to find that English women can be led into intrigues, but adds that a "Spaniard is born and bred to it: 'tis not climate but nature."[1] That the general depravity of the age, in England as well as in Spain or elsewhere, is reflected in these portrayals is no doubt true; but that Cibber and other English writers wished to satirize the Spaniard in thus sketching him as so low morally, is no doubt also true. The Englishman had not yet lost his hatred for the Don.

The unfavorable representation that English play-wrights gave their Castilian characters was, no doubt, due to national prejudice. The hatred existing between England and Spain had continued for several hundred years, certainly from before the Armada. Each nation took opportunity to denounce, ridicule, and satirize the other; each had a whole-hearted contempt for the other. If, then, an English play-wright presented on the stage Spaniards who repelled, the English prejudice of the audinece would acclaim the writer as clever and patriotic. The temptation, therefore, to create bad Spaniards led the play-wrights to exaggeration. In The Rover, Don Carlos is described as wearing "a shirt so nasty a cleanly ghost would not appear in't at the latter day;"[2] and Blunt says the devil and his tailor could devise no greater punishment for him than to make him wear a Spanish habit - "the mode of the Nation I abominate." Sir Lubberly refuses to fall in love with Lady Bearley because of her "Madrid-Face."[3]

1. Thomas Southern, I, i, 1726.
2. Aphra Behn, II, ii, 1677.
3. "The Virtuous Wife," - Durfey, V, i, 1680.

We do not, then, find well-formulated types of Spaniards; but we do find all Castilians as a class looked upon with disfavor by the English dramatists of the century.

The Welshman.

Two types of Welshmen are distinctly marked in seventeenth and eighteenth century English comedy - the amorous intriguer, and the ancestor worshipped. In these plays Welshmen usually discuss but two topics, genealogy and courtship. In Sir Barnaby Whigg, Winifred finds that "shentlemens have creat deals of lyes and fraudulences now-a-days, and cheats poor maids out of honor and virginities."[1] Benedick, in this play, finds that "there's nothing to be done by fair means with any of that country (Wales)." In the Richmond Heiress, Tom Romance cannot eat, drink, or sleep without women, and declares "my Welch Cousin Rice ap Shinken here is of my own Humour to a Hair." The Welshman corroborates the statement with, "the plack Eyes, the plack Eyebrows, was goot; and when her sees the Red Lip, the White Skin, then Shenkens Heart was peat, peat, peat like a Drum." So he sets about "to have de Intriague."[2] In The Fair Example, Rice ap Adam is more fearful of his wife's entering some intrigue than ready to do so himself. He adds, "Sir, tho' 'this as fashionable as a full Wigg, I'm not for Cuckoldom."[3]

In The Female Fortune-Teller, Apwigeon fears that his wife has been unfaithful to him - these dissolute old Welshmen are always solicitous about their wive's chastity; so he goes to

1. "Sir Barnaby Whigg," Thomas Durfey, II, i, 1681.
2. "Richmond Heiress," - Durfey, I, i, 1693.
3. "The Fair Example, " Richard Estcourt, I, i, 1706.

Dr. Spring to have her restored.[1] Spring promises to bring her back by enchantment and other occult means, but he demands a fee of seven pieces of gold. Apwigeon argues that he loved his wife, but another woman slandered him to her, saying that a husband was but a mask "to cover and tisguise her peccant Humours." So Apwigeon chastizes her "to cool and temperate the Petulance of her Tongue and her Plood," but she deserts him again while he is asleep. He is willing to be consoled over the loss of his wife finally; but the fact that she carried away with her "a thousand Pieces of her Ancestor's goot old Cold," that is too much for him.

The Welshman is sometimes represented as an ancestor worshipper and eighteenth century English play-wrights, Richard Estcourt, Charles Johnson, Samuel Foote, and others, seem to satirize this proclivity in him. "Heralds and genealogists are as useful in a state as Lawyers or Physicians" says Sir Rice-ap-Adam in The Fair Temple. He presents a document for Lord Mushroom, in which he proves his Lordship to be the three hundred and fiftieth by descent from Alarich, a turn-spit in King Pippin's kitchen. He relates how "this turn-spit marry'd the Scullion's Daughter, and by her had twenty-four Children, seventeen of which," and so on. The whole is a satire on Welsh genealogical pretensions. He tells how from these sinkmen and scullions Marquesses and Barons arose, and that their posterity came over with William the Conqueror, the youngest of which was forebear of my Lord Mush-room. Apwigeon has heard that Dr. Spring

1. "The Female Fortune-Teller," Charles Johnson, IV, i, 1726.

is a descendent from the wise Merlin, our Pritish Incanter." Accordingly, he thinks Spring must have handed down to him some of the charms that will reduce his wife to her Apedience and her Vertues again."[1]

Amusing parodies on family pride are found in various comedies of the eighteenth century. In Love Betrayed,[2] Drances has told the butler that a certain young lady loves him. Moreno asks what effect this bit of intelligence had on the butler. We are told that the butler at once went to a tailor that he might be made a gentleman, and that "taylors make more gentlemen a year than a Welch genealogist." Likewise, in The Last of the Family, Flexible tells Beau Tiffany "your father has been cramming such a cargo of Welch pedigree into my ears;" and adds, "what a happy fellow you are whose genealogy goes no further than the day-book."[3]

Boasting of ancestry is so common in the presentation of Welsh characters that one wonders how much is based on fact and how much is mere travesty. In The Author, Cadwallader boasts of being "of as ancient a family as the best of them." Then he asks Beck to get him his pedigree, which we learn is at home locked up in the butler's pantry.[4] Other characters rally Cadwallader on his boasted genealogy, and twit him about being of obscure birth. We learn that this Welshman wants his son to meet the sons of noblemen. He holds that high acquaintences are the only benefit education can give his son. Like a modern

1. Richard Estcourt, I, i, 1706.
2. "Love Betrayed," Buraby, I, i, 1703.
3. "The Last of the Family, " Richard Cumberland, III, i, 1797.
4. "The Author," - Foote, I, ii.

"climber," he seeks to be introduced to lords, viscounts, and earls, and to be admitted to their tables. Such are the spirit and ambitions of Welsh characters as represented in eighteenth century English comedy.

This pride in family leads to much buffoonery at the Welsh character's expense. In Sir Burnaby Whigg, Rice ap Shinken receives some "delicate creen Lecks" sent by the young widow of her cousin Tomas ap Evan, ap Rice, ap Shones, ap Davy, ap Shinken as a token of love. A character, Winifred, dampens his ardor by saying that she never saw a man with his crop-ears and night cap, but she thought of a "crete Rogue, one Shinken, ap Powell, ap Shone, ap Davy, ap Cadwaller, that was hanged in Montgomery."[1] Shinken is a rogue who assists Tom Romance in his intrigues with women. Much of the dialogue is occupied with the Welshman's boastful pretences, and the bauter of other characters who discredit his pompous pride and ridicule his plotting and intriguing.

1. "Sir Barnaby Whigg, " Thomas Durfey, V, ii, 1681.

The Jew.

The Jews are represented in eighteenth century English comedy largely as a race that deserves contempt; a race to be ridiculed and persecuted. Play-wrights agree quite generally in this treatment. Foote sets the race forth in a ridiculous light.[1] O'Keefe has "Crumpy" mark for death the tailor, the quack doctor, and the Jew. He places them all in the same class.[2] Macklin, who championed the Irishman and other characters, ridiculed the Jew.[3] The Israelite is a character who tyrannizes over his inferiors, flatters those from whom he expects profit, and fawns upon his superiors. Accordingly, "Amalekite" addresses his servants: "Now vork you damned Polish dogs! or bastinado's the vord;" then he turns to Rachel, a young girl, and says: "My little plump cherry ... it's the mild tender passion of love ... 'twas for your sake I did not turn your fader Witski out of his mill to starve." To Rodomsko, however, who is a nobleman, he bows very low and murmurs "Heavin save your gracious lord!"[4] The contempt for Jews shown in this treatment was the common attitude shown by other characters in the plays toward Hebrews. Squire Chase tells Ephraim to "clear the road," for he expects a gentleman, and therefore "must not be seen in such company" as a Jew; and when Ephraim replies, a bit saucily to be sure, Chace threatens to call his hounds and whippers to teach

1. "The Cozeners," I, i, 1774.
2. "The Little Hunchback," II, iv, 1787.
3. "Love à la Mode," II, i, 1793.
4. "Zorinski, " Thomas Morton, I, ii, 1795.

"the respect due from such reptiles as you to their betters."[1]

To such an extent was prejudice directed against this persecuted race that Cumberland made it his special object to come to the Jew's defence, as he did in case of the Irishman, and to remove some of the prejudice. He begins by telling of a report in a news-paper of a dreadful fire. Five hundred persons perished was the report, but "it was with satisfaction," he could assure the readers, "all above persons were Jews."[2] Cumberland goes on then to say that these poor people are the butt of all sects and persuasions. He sees no reason for such treatment, for he delcares the Jews do not intrude upon the laborer or the manufacturer, nor do they burden the state with their poor. He then quotes as follows from a letter which he has received from a Jew: -

> "I no sooner enter a playhouse, than I find all eyes turned upon me; ... this is sure to be followed up with a thousand scurrilities, which I should blush to repeat and which I cannot think of subjecting my wife to hear."

Some of the remarks flung at Jews in public places were: "Smoke the Jew," "throw him over," "hand over the smoutch," "smoke the cunning little Isaac," "Out with the Shylock," "Buckles and buttons! Spectacles," etc.[3]

The letter addressed to Cumberland was a pathetic appeal to him for help. It begged Cumberland to "persuade one of the gentlemen or ladies who write plays ... to give us poor Jews a kind lift in the comedy," and it ended with a promise that in

1. "The School for Prejudices," Thomas Dibdin, II, i, 1801.
2. "The Observer," Vol. III, No. 64, p. 31.
3. Ibid, Vol. III, No. 64, pp. 29-30.

such a case they "should not prove ungrateful on a third night." Cumberland came to the rescue. He defended the Jews by asking the English public Shylock's questions; - "Hath not the Jew eyes, etc.?" He declared that a person who can give a serious answer to these questions, and yet persist in his persecutions, has the soul of an inquisitor, and "is fit for nothing else but to feed the fires of an Auto da Fé."

Two types of Jew characters are represented in these comedies - the Jewish fop, and the usurer. The Jew who protested to Cumberland against the treatment his race received at the hands of English play-wrights, declared that if these writers "are in search of a rogue, an usurer, or a buffoon, they are sure to make a Jew serve the turn." Both Foote and Macklin represented the Jew as buffoon. Macklin wanted Beau Mordecai to be impersonated as an egregious coxcomb, who strove to be witty, to dress ridiculously, and to act in a silly way.[1] Macklin's Jew has a lively manner, sings, dances, struts, and puts on all the airs of a conceited fop. In this fashion Macklin wanted Mr. Quick to act the part of Mordecai, as is shown by a letter he wrote Quick.[2] Thus he has Charlotte speak of Mordecai, her lover, as a "beau Jew who, in spite of nature and education, sets up for a wit, a gentleman, and a man of taste."[3]

Moses Monasses in <u>The Cozeners</u> is also a love-making fop. He "always finds de ladies very partial" to him; he is chosen "maister of de ceremony to de Mile-end assembly; and Mrs. Alderman always chooses him "for de cotillions." The other characters in

1. "Love à la Mode," Charles Macklin, II, i, 1793.
2. "Monthly Mirror," 1798.
3. "Eminent Actors," William Archer, Pt. III, p. 140.

the play cozen Moses, but he takes it as flattery, and acts accordingly. He holds that ambition in life is to live "at de court-end of de town."[1]

The presentation in comedy of the Jew as a cunning usurer, is common during the eighteenth century. Davila, in Money the Mistress, says that she would rather trust Mohomet with paradise than certain Jews in their dealings.[2] Even Mordecai of Love à la Mode, by Macklin the friend of Jews, is "a mere casualty sprung frae annuties, bulls, bears, lottery tickets,"[3] as Mac Sarcasm, the Scotchman in the play, puts it. In The Jew of Venice, Lord Lausdowne introduces a feast with a Jew who drinks to his money as his only mistress. ("Biographia Dramatica." Vol. III, p. 345.) In The School for Prejudice, Mrs. Howard tells Rachel that if Christians' extravagance did not furnish "the ground of Jewish usury, the sons of Israel wou'd be more respected."[4]

The School for Prejudice represents the usurous Jew at some length. Ephraim shows that usury was a part of his earliest education. He had no mother; so, before he was a month old, his brother Moses carried him about in his basket along with buttons, sealing wax, and other notions, and when he cried, Moses gave him "the cushtomer's money to play mid, because he knowed vat I cou'dn't never be quiet mitout it." The "Landlord" tells Ephraim that he has heard from country people how Ephraim gives money to the poor, and adds, "you couldn't learn that among your own

1. "The Cozeners," - Foote, I, i, 1774.
2. Thomas Southern, IV, i, 1720.
3. II, i, 1793.
4. "School for Prejudice," T. Dibdin, I, ii, 1801.

people." The Jew replies that it was "a part of de stock in trade" given him, and that he must "put it out to lawful interest." The Landlord asks Ephraim for a loan of £200, but the Jew makes the customary reply of his race, "de people dink vat a Jew made of Money." Mrs. Howard sells Ephraim a richly laced suit of clothes. She bids him take the clothes away, look over them at his leisure, and in the evening bring her what he can pay for them. In spite of this trustfulness on her part, the Jew bids her remember that if the bargain is not made before her face, he could not promise not to get the better of her. When she speaks of his reputation for honesty, he retorts with: "So much de vorse - it's de ruin of all pusiness. I lose twenty per cent by it every day." Then in an aside he mutters, "so de moder and de daughter do all de can to sheat von anoder. I didn't think nobody but a Jew could be guilty of such a ting."[1] Later Friendly tells the Jew that there is money in the suit he has just bought, and wishes it restored. Ephraim, however, replies that he bought "de things; and if dere is money, it is ma own." Friendly urges that the money belonged to a poor widow; but the Jew is obdurate: "If dere is money to be found, I shall see vat is vorth ma vile to do mit it ... a Jew knows his interest as vell as a lawyer, or else de devil's in it."

Such depiction shows in what estimation the Jew was held during the Eighteenth century in England. As a fop he tried to insinuate himself into a class and society alien to him, and far above what he had any right to aspire to; as a man of business, he snatched up all the money within reach, and held on to it

1. Ibid., II, i.

regardless of whose it was. He is portrayed as a heartless usurer with no interest in life except to hoard money, and no regard for others except so far as such regard may bring him the more gold. If, as seems the case, play-wrights generally found so little good in the Israelite, we wonder what prompted Cumberland to come to his rescue.

The Dutch Types.

It is difficult to fashion the Dutch characters, as they are represented in our study, into any distinct type. Play-wrights speak of the Dutchman - often merely refer to him - in such varied, and often slight ways, that their presentation of him is rarely unified enough to form a type. Aphra Behn presents a Dutch character who does not like the Spanish way of making love, "that's unattended with wine and music;" he prefers a "wench that will out-drink the Dutch."[1] Another play by the same writer represents two Dutch physicians, sham-doctors, who have a sure cure for Sir Patient, but are driven out with threats.[2] This play, however, is based on Molière's Le Malade Imaginaire. Usually the Hollander is spoken of as a heavy drinker, but Otway portrays him as a sober character; for honesty and sobriety, he thinks that Doodvil would make a good Dutch Burgomaster.[3] Durfey makes Mrs. Stockjobb say, "de Brandy is de Regale for de Dutch, not de French."[4] Brandy, the play tells us, will make the Frenchman dull as a dog, the Dutchman fight the devil. Charles Burnaby has several characters discuss the beauty of women in Flanders.[5] And Mrs. Centlivre makes the English Fainwell marry a Dutch Burgomaster's daughter, after a certain amount of disreputable acting on his part, and some shrewd, courageous determination on hers -- plus

1. "The Dutch Lover," III, ii, 1673.
2. "Sir Patient Fancy," 1678.
3. "Friendship in Fashion," III, i, 1678.
4. "Richmond Heiress." II, i, 1693.
5. "The Reformed Wife," 1700.

a large fortune that she seems suddenly to have inherited.[1] Judging from these varied presentations, we must conclude that the English play-wrights of the time had no fixed opinion of Dutch traits or characteristics. Indeed, as we see from the foregoing, they sometimes speak in a contradictory way of the Hollander. To one writer the Dutchman was a hard drinker; to another he was known for his sobriety. Opinion had not apparently crystalized sufficiently to form well defined types, or he may have been merely a shadow of the Elizabethan Dutchman.

The nearest to fixing him as a type was to represent the Dutchman as a merchant, a trader on land or sea. Mrs. Centlivre informs us that the Dutch "understand trade better than any other nation under the sun;"[2] and in the same play a character speaks of the Dutchman as being a fine husband, for he will dress his wife "in all the pride of Europe, Africa, and America." Apparently the Dutch merchant was known for his wealth, and judging from the above instance, for his outlandish tastes in dress. Cumberland represents a Dutch merchant as understanding the market.[3] O'Keefe has a Dutch merchant, Captain Vansluisen, lose his cargo at sea. He is attacked by a French ship, captured, and then in turn overpowers his captors and recovers the cargo.[4] In another play by O'Keefe a merchant is spoken of in the Prologue as follows:

1. "The Artifice," 1721, At the end of play.
2. "A Bold Stroke for a Wife," V, i, 1718.
3. "The Choleric Man," - Cumberland, III, i, 1775.
4. "The World in a Village," O'Keefe, II, ii, 1793.

"To touch on Antwerp, you may suppose
We mean to talk of treaties, bargains, blows!
He say, Mynheer, his warehouses to jam,
First turn'd the tide of trade to Amsterdam."[1]

The Dutchman apparently was, then, a merchant; but how he differed from the English or French merchant, that is not shown.

Still the Dutchman is fashioned as distinct from other nationalities represented. This is partly due to the odd figure in which he is carved, or the outlandish dress that he wears. He appears as a sort of yokel, or chub, or clown. Play-wrights thus discriminate between him and other nationalities. He is sketched in definite physical outline. "A Dutch man is thick;" a "Dutch woman is squab"[2] (Farquhar); a Dutch horse is round; a Dutch ship is brood-bottomed. One would swear the whole product of the country were cast in the same mould with their cheeses."[3] He is marked by other yokel features. A Dutch Boatswain "knocked 'em out for railing against his whiskers;"[4] "he looked as rough as a Dutch Corporal;"[5] "Dutchmen from the waist downward, all Trowsers."[6] He has no more idea of dress than a Dutchman,"[7] "We find him a clownish fat Flanderkin, joking and laughing at his own jokes."[8]

Amusement at the Dutchman was sometimes turned into ridicule, and even contempt, of him in eighteenth century comedy. Durfey shows this attitude in a speech by a character,

1. "The Blacksmith of Antwerp," John O'Keefe, 1798.
2. "The Inconstant," I, ii, 1702.
3. Ibid.
4. "The Successful Pirate," Charles Johnson, I, i, 1713.
5. "Love's Last Shift, " - Cibber, II, i, 1730.
6. "The Universal Passion," James Miller, III, i, 1737.
7. "A Trip to Calais," - Foote, I, i, 1778.
8. "The Marriage Hater Matched," - Durfey, I, i, 1692.

"Callow:" "his name they tell me is Mynheer van Grinn, and, rot me, 'tis very well apply'd, for he does nothing but grin and make faces all the while he is talking."[1] This character calls van Grinn a blockhead, and speaks of his stupidity. In another play Sir Philip Modelove is made to exclaim: "A Dutchman! ha! ha! There's a husband for a fine lady - ya frow, will you meet Mun Stapen - ha! ha! ha! I'll learn you to talk the language of the hogs, madam."[2] In The Blacksmith of Antwerp we find the stupid servant type thus turned into ridicule. Yacob is "always ready too soon, or he is not ready at all; he under-does or he over-does."[3] His master bids him always to "say my words exactly;" so the servant repeats his master's criticism of customers when they come to trade. The effect is ludicrous, but one cannot help seeing underneath it all a feeling of contempt which the English must have felt for Hollanders generally.

Whether or not, then, we can classify the Dutchman into definite types we cannot fail to see that, as portrayed, he differs from all other nationalities represented. He is crude, grotesque, outlandish. This applies especially to his external appearance.

1. Ibid.
2. "A Bold Stroke for a Wife," Mrs. Centlivre, V, i, 1718.
3. "The Blacksmith of Antwerp, " O'keefe, I, iii, 1798.

The German.

In The Idea of Comedy, Meredith speaks of the comic elements in the Germans as follows: "The German isOrson, or the mob, or a marching army....His irony is a missile of terrific tonnage; sarcasm he emits like a blast from a dragon's mouth. He must and will be Titan. He stamps his foe under foot, and is astonished that the creature is not dead, but stinging."[1] This idea of German cumbersomeness, of rudeness, of violence, and especially of brutal exultation of the conqueror over his prostrate foe, is frequently represented in eighteenth century English comedy.

The brutal soldier is a clearly drawn type of German. He differs materially from the harmless, talkative Irish soldier, or the Roman "Miles Gloriosus;" his vaunting does not, like theirs, merely pass out into words. He does not stop at boasting of how he will stamp his foe into the dust; he literally performs the deed if he has the power, and glories over the prostrate form. In short, when the English writer fashions a German soldier for the stage, he is, as we have seen in our study of the Irish soldier, quite ready to teach his ally, the Irish mercenary, how to kill men, women, and children. He is portrayed as a vain-glorious brute. In The Inconstant, we are told how Mirabell marched up to the German trenches, where he saw "a parcel of scare-crow, olive-colored gun-powder fellows,

1. p. 104.

as ugly as the devil."[1] He calls the Germans "unmannerly, rude, unsociable dogs." If we are to judge from the remarks of a young woman, Hillaria, in Tunbridge Walks, who holds that the education young women in England receive at dancing scholls is conducive to greater havoc "than the Germans did among the fine Fiddles at the Battle of Cremona, his remark may be true."[2] In Humours of Oxford, Trumore makes this statement: "And my Young One treats me with so much Insolence, I am more afraid to face her than I should be a whole Regiment of Prussian Grenadiers."[3] James Cobb paints Captain Strumwald, a German soldier, as an ugly, heavy drinking, boastful fighter,[4] and O'Keefe, about the same time, in Le Grenadier, takes a fling at the Germans by having a character sing "To the Germans I'll give a few Knocks,"[5] and by having a group of Germans driven off the stage by a mob of people. In Zorinski, we learn that the "Teutonic Knights have disgraced their order, turning from Christian service and true chivalry to deeds of usurpation and dominion."[6] All these statements agree on one dominating trait for the German - ferocity. The attitude of English play-wrights toward Germans during the eighteenth century, probably because of King William's Wars, or because of the English dislike of her Hanoverian Rulers, the Georges, is almost always unfavorable.

France and Germany have been enemies from time immemorial, and wherever this fact is treated in play or story, the German,

1. Farquhar, I, ii, 1702.
2. "Tunbridge Walks," Thomas Baker, II, i, 1703.
3. James Miller, I, i, 1730.
4. "The Doctor and the Apothecary," II, iii, 1788.
5. I, iv, 1789.
6. Thomas Morton, I, i, 1803.

especially the Prussian, thinks of but one thing, and that is annihilation. Therefore, Durfey's statement of certain German deeds, sounds very characteristic: "I'll strut and look as gruff as a German trooper over a cowering Frenchman that he resolves to give no quarters to."[1] In The Maid of Bath, we are told that Germany is the grave for Frenchmen.[2]

An excellent example of the Prussian cold-blooded brutality obtains in Love in a Camp, where we find the following dialogue: -

> Marshall Fehrbellin - "A tall woman (aside). What's your name?"
> Mabel Flourish - "Mabel Flourish ... My father was a trumpeter in the guards."
> Marshall - "Ha! I remember him - Are you married?"
> Mabel - "No, please your Highness....."
> Marshall - "Not married, ha (surveying her). To match her with one of our tallest men must produce soldiers of full standard -- Ha! yonder's a good tall fellow -- Soldier! (calls. Olmutz advances. Marshall looks alternately at him and Mabel.) They must do very well. (Aside.) Soldier, you are married?"
> Olmutz - "No - Highness."
> Marshall - "...I'll have this perform'd, and by our new Irish Captain; it will give him a sample of the strictness of our Prussian military discipline."[3]

The comedy ends in a joke played on the Marshall for the Irish Captain marries the girl himself. The dialogue, however, illustrates what must have been the attitude of English writers toward Prussian militarism even in those early times. It is one more evidence of the brutal German soldier as represented in a comedy of the eighteenth century.

Another type of German recurring in English comedy of the century is the mountebank, or faker. We find the mountebank

1. "Modern Prophets," V, i, 1709.
2. - Foote, III, i, Foote.
3. - O'Keefe, I, ii, 1785.

doctor, the mountebank painter, the mountebank philosopher, the juggler, etc. Doctor Von Gasterman glibly runs over his catalogue of fake remedies - "de anodyne, de epepastic, de balsamic, de narcotic, de diaphoretic, de expectoratic, de restoratif, de emulsif, de encisif; which is efery thing, so shweet and so delectable as all vat is possible."[1] He says, that he "vas practice mit all de piggest family in de uniferse;" he "is known efery pody;" he has diplomatic and counsellor influence; he pays his respects "mit de duke, mit de lordt, und mit de grandee." He had "hundert and tousand patient dat die efery day" till he came to London. He is called to the city, he is called to the country. He tells how he came to Englandt mit little money, and great cunning in de art, und de science." It is interesting to notethat he speaks in that early day of using "de electric und de magnetic" in his medical practice. At any rate, he says "I make de nation benefit, und myself rish." As represented, his chief object is to make himself rich. He enters also into the private affairs of people. Every where he goes he "vas meet" his "besten friend." It is interesting moreover, to note what diseases he finds common to different ranks and classes of English society. Among the lords, grandees, etc., he finds "de hypochondrica, de spasmodica, de hysterica, de morosina, de morbid affection, de tremor, und de mist before de eye." He calls these the diseases of the great. Then he accredits lawyers and men who frequent inns of the court with "de hydropica, de pheumatica, and de paralytica."

1. "He's Much to Blame," Thomas Holcroft, I, viii, 1798.

Next we find the mountebank juggler, who goes about leading a monkey that is trained to do tricks. Joanna Baillie has made Manhauslet steal a boy and educate him along with his ape to dance, do tricks, etc. In the process of the comedy the child finds a new home with a kind woman, but is represented as being loath to leave the juggler, apparently so portrayed to show the dangers resulting from these way-faring practicioners. Some of the humor, or satire, afforded by the German is found in such statements as, "Thou hast given him (the boy) a notable education no doubt, and a fine varlet he will be to receive into any family." The boy and the ape were together given the same food, the same education. A young lady, Miss Frankland, ask whether the boy prayed in the German tongue, to which another character, Miss Brown, replies, "No; heaven forbid, madam, that he should speak to his Creator in such a jargon as that." They call the German "that heathenish vagrant Manhaunslet."[1]

The Mountebank artist is illustrated in Monsieur Baron de Croningen. Brush, a painter, and Carmine proceed to sell worthless "originals" to Lord Dupe and others, and have de Groningen join with them in the fraud. Brush addresses Lord Dupe thus, - "My Lord, you need not depend solely on my judgment; here is Mynheer Baron de Gronigen, come hither to survey and purchase for the elector of Bavaria, an indisputable connoisseur; his bidding will be a direction for your lordship."[2] The German character has no other part in this play than to defraud Lord Dupe.

1. "Enthusiasm," III, ii.
2. "Taste," Samuel Foote, II, i, 1752.

In Alienated Manor, we have the mountebank philosopher, Smitcherstault. He does not find "de grand, de sublime" in the heart. A character asks whether it is in the stomach. "No," he says, "de soul, dere be de sublime virtue. My sentiments, my enthusiasm." He runs on in loquacious repetition about "sublime virtue." Other characters try to distract and jostle him, but he still speaks on. He imagines seeing Sir Robertpass through a haunted chamber; therefore the man did pass through, for imagination is reality. Mrs. Charville asks, "but did you actually see a man pass? and was it this identical man?" He replies, "In de imaginations I see one man very like dat man." He holds that this was sufficient, for "de imaginations is all dat we do know;" and adds, "de veritable real true is a foolish notion - is a notting. In mine imagination I see Sir Robert, and if in imagination he was not dere, what can I help dat?"[1] He tries to demonstrate to Mr. Charville that landscape is philosophically beautiful as well as visibly so. Smitchenstault is also a type of eighteenth century sentimentalist. He goes into ecstasies over fine phrases and pretty analogies; he falls in loveat first sight with the woman who uses such phrases; and he hires servants to carry love missives for him. His actions stamp him one of the fops of eighteenth century comedies.

The treatment of these montebanks supports what Meredith says in his Idea of Comedy, namely, that the idea of the comic to the Germans "comes of unrefined, abstract fancy, grotesque or grim, or gross.....Sentimentalism waylays them in the flight."[2] Smithcenstault possesses all of these characteristics - fancy, grotesqueness, grossness, sentimentalism.

1. "Alienated Manor," Joanna Baillie, I, ii.
2. P. 61.

The Turk.

There is but one type to which the Turk is made to conform in eighteenth century English comedy, that is, the murderous Turk. The Turk is always spoken of in these plays as a barbarian, a murderous cut-throat, who took pleasure in causing terror, suffering, and death. Aphra Behn has a captive speak of the Sultan as a monster;[1] Mrs. Centlivre calls the Ottoman the barbarous Turk "whose sword is more to be feared than Mahomet's curse;[2] and Colman represents him as savage and bloody.[3] Other writers join in calling their Turkish characters ferocious and barbarous.

The idea of Turkish ferocity is, however, at times used simply for humorous effect. The inconsistencey, when considered from our view point, of such a cut throat as the Ottoman loving, enabled the play-wright to draw very odd situations. Thus Durfey has a character make love like a Turk; nothing but a seraglio of women could serve his turn;[4] and Charles Johnson has one man suggest that he would like to be a Turkish husband, "where every man hath a little Seraglio of wives, which he receives and turns off at pleasure."[5] Being the Sultana, or any other Turkish wife, also fired the English imagination in a humorous way. In <u>The False Count</u>, Quinlion says to Isabella, "Should the Grand Seignior behold thy Beauty,

1. "False Count," II, ii, 1682.
2. "Perplex'd Lovers," Dedication to Prince Eugene of Savoy, 1712.
3. "Man and Wife," II, i, 1770.
4. "Sir Barnaby Whigg," II, i, 1681.
5. "The Gentleman Cully," V, i, 1702.

thou wouldst despise thine own dear Viscount to become a Sultana;" and Isabella cries, "Heavens! to be Queen of Turkey."[1] The fancy of being wife to a Mussulman, especially to that chief monster, the Sultan, made one writer fashion a ludicrous situation. In a play by Bickerstoff, an English girl is represented as captured and placed in the Sultan's seraglio. Here her charm of manner, vivacity, and boldness completely captivate the Sultan, and get him into her power. "Who would have thought," says the keeper of the harem, "that a little cocked-up nose would have overturned the customs of a mighty empire?"[2] This is the kind of matter that the Restoration and eighteenth century liked.

1. "The False Count," Aphra Behn, IV, i, 1682.
2. "The Sultan," 1787.

The Negro Servant.

Only one type of negro is represented in eighteenth century English comedy - the negro servant. But, it is interesting to note, the negro servant is never looked down upon in these plays; in face, he is sometimes made quite a hero. Such is the case of Sambo in Laugh When You Can.[1] Sambo's acts are the acts of high intelligence, as well as of high mindedness. He protests against his master's paying court to another man's wife; for he does not want a man who once saved his life to be guilty of infidelity. Again, when his master declares that, because he had given Sambo his freedom, he did not wish him to interfere, Sambo reflies that gratitude for his freedom would impel him to prevent his master from courting disaster. Later, however, when the question of divorce between his master and mistress arises, and the negro is offered a purse by his mistress if he will give evidence against his master, he throws down the purse, saying, "S'Life! - does she think I'll betray my master?" Again, when another character, Delville, tries to keep master and mistress apart, Sambo protests, saying that there never was even in his "uncivilized country a being savage enough to part them." He pleads with husband and wife for a reconciliation; he prays that they will thereby make him, a poor fellow, happy. Finally, when the reconciliation is effected, he sings, dances,

1. "Laugh When You Can," Frederick Reynolds, IV, ii, 1799.

and catches their child in his arms in great glee. Reynolds accredits this negro with intelligence and mental reserve quite high for any servant, to say nothing of a negro, especially for that early day.

We find, however, a negro servant of high intelligence in a play somewhat earlier than Reynold's. This is Sancho in Alienated Manor.[1] A character, Charville, has brought Sancho's master into ill repute, for which in a moment of remorse Charville contemplates suicide. Sancho, hidden behind a thicket, sees Charville approach with a pistol, which he, however, throws aside. The negro then bursts from his hiding place, seizes the weapon, and offers to shoot Charville; for he will not spare the man "who ruinated my massa." Another man, Crafton, prevents the tragedy, and promises that no harm shall come to Sancho's master. To this the negro exclaims: "O good massa Crafton! me tank you, me embrace you, me kneel to you!" We cannot readily believe that a negro of that time had reached so high a state of civilization. Yet Aphra Behn had before this presented a negro, Oroonok, who was a "great and just character," and whose "discourse was admirable upon almost any subject."[2] In fact, Oroonoko is based on a still earlier work, a pamphlet entitled An Impartial Description of Surinam.[3] Apparently play-wrights did not know the negro well, and so accredited him with the intelligence of white servants. At any rate, such a conjecture gains support from a play by James Townley.[4] In this play white men and women servants mingle

1. Joanna Baille, V, ii.
2. "Oroonoko; or the Royal Slave," 1688.
3. George Warren, London, 1667.
4. "High Life Below Stairs," James Townley, II, i, 1759.

freely with black, indulge together in frolicks in their master's kitchen, become intoxicated together on their master's wines, and cheat their master in various ways. In fact, in all their actions and conversations, color or race does not seem a conscious factor or barrier.

Bickerstaffe seems to have understood negro character better than other writers of the century did.[1] He represents a black, Mungo, who curses his master, until the master hears him and asks what he is muttering; then the negro at once becomes submissive. It is nothing, "only me say you very good, massa." The master, a Spaniard, bribes him to tell of any mischief in the house. The negro then merely complains that the mischief is in his being whipped with a rattan, although he does nothing but "worky, worky." This description of a negro servant is more true to his nature; the language attributed to him, however, does not sound like a negro's speech. It is in the manner of speech that play-wrights of the eighteenth century show their ignorance of the negro.

The negro servant appears in a number of other comedies. Charles Burnaby portrays a negro servant in The Ladies' Visiting Day, 1701, as having a flat nose and great collar, which made him fancy that "they had dress'd up a Dutch Mastiff."[2] This is the only instance in eighteenth century English comedy in which referance is made to the black man's appearance. Apparently that was of secondary consideration to writers of plays. Usually the negro servant was merely a supernumerary, who did not enter into the complication or resolution of the plot.

1. "The Padlock," - Bickerstaffe, I, i, 1768.
2. I, ii.

The Americans.

Any references to America in a play so early as the eighteenth century English comedy, will at once arouse our curiosity. Several play-wrights of the century try to create types peculiar to America, such as the Pennsylvania Quaker and the Indian; the persons thus created are not, however, peculiar enough or general enough to be classified into types. The examples are too few for any generalizations. In fact, references made to America are usually to conditions here, rather than to people. For instance, Hugh Kelly speaks of Boston and the Connecticutt coast as a savage place where people tar and feather undesirable individuals.[1] Sheridan has a character in The Critic, read a memorandum to the effect that Paul Jones ought to be taken.[2] Another reference to Paul Jones is made in the Belle's Stratagem.[3] Both plays were written at the time that relations between England and America were strained; hence the reference to Paul Jones. The Quakers of Pennsylvania, however, may be spoken of as types, and so conceived by Englishmen of the time. Mrs. Centlivre seems to have regarded them as types, and held them up to ridicule. In A Bold Stroke for a Wife, she represents Simon Pure as a Pennsylvania Quaker, and holds him up to ridicule by saying, "There's a fine husband for a young lady."[4]

1. "Romance of an Hour," Hugh Kelly, Epilogue, 1774.
2. "The Critic," - Sheridan, I, ii, 1779.
3. "The Belle's Stratagem," Mrs. Cowley, I, iii, 1780.
4. "A Bold Stroke for a Wife," - Centlivre, V, i, 1718.

The American Indian appears a number of times in English comedy of the century. Here he is made, as we might suppose, a savage, treacherous and bloody. O'Keefe represents an Englishman, Wattle, as wandering in the country of the Iroquois and the Illinois. Apparently these two tribes are chosen as the most ferocious of American savages, for he says that had Wattle "nine lives they're not worth a cat's paw."[1] Several other references to American Indians are made, of their blood-thirsty nature, and of their massacres; but there is no attempt at defining the Red Man as belonging to distinct types. The only two classes of American people spoken of by play-wrights of the Restoration or the eighteenth century, with any definiteness, are the Indian and the Pennsylvania Quaker. These might be classed as types if they occurred often enough; but the paucity of any such representation does not justify our designating them as American types. English play-wrights, of course, knew that a genuine Indian could not be got to act on an English stage. Yet one instance is found of a Red Man, Tomba Chequi, who is brought to England to appear in vaudeville. He quarrels with a Jew pedlar whom he threatens to scalp, to the delight of thespectators.[2] When needed on the stage, the Indian was usually an Anglo-Saxon painted red.

1. "The Basket Maker," John O'Keefe, I, i, 1790.
2. "The Critical Review," Vol. II, p. 199.

Other Nationalities.

Of other nationalities, the Hindu is represented several times, as in Cibber's Sick Lady's Cure,[1] and Holman's Votary of Wealth.[2] There is, however, nothing in his presentation to call forth special comment. When present, these East Indians are usually pedlars, servants, or wards of some rich Englishman. They are exhibited, no doubt, to satisfy the curiosity of English spectators at a time when England became interested in East Indian affairs.

The Russian also appears a few times. A Russian or Pole is a leading character in Zorinski[3] - that is, an Englishman disguised as a Russian. There is, however, no special interest attached to the character. O'Keefe introduces the Russian Czar in The Czar Peter, a play which is, however, a comic opera rather than a comedy proper.

If odd aliens are represented in the guise of Chinamen, Moors, and others, they are merely trappings of the stage-craft to suit an eighteenth century whim. In one play we have an account of how one lady of fashion satisfied her longing for the bizarre. "Her Rooms are of Japan, and her Dress Indian; the Coachman and his Horses are of a country, both Turks, the rest of her Trim are a motly Crowd of Blacks, Tawny Olives, Phelamots, and pole Blews! In Short, she's for anything that

1. III, i,
2. II, i, J. H. Holman.
3. Thomas Morton, 1795.

comes from beyond the Sea."[1] This love for the outlandish and spectacular was common to Dryden's and other Restoration drama, and had not lost vogue in early eighteenth century English comedy.

In the study of this subject- "Foreigners Represented as National Types in the English Comedy of the Restoration and the Eighteenth Century" - many difficulties have been encountered. The field has been large, the period covered long, the characters varied, the influences many, the treatment by various playwrights vicarious; hence this dissertation has necessarily consumed much time in the way of research and organization. Besides, care had to be exercised to discriminate between type characters which were actually foreign, and those which were not; those whose speech, action, and temperament stamped them as French, Irish, or Dutch, and those which were French, Irish, or Dutch merely in name. All types that were obviously English have been barred; thestudy has been one of foreign types only. That one could not, indeed, prove some of the characters represented in this thesis as actually like Frenchmen or actually like Scotchmen, let us say, is obvious, Yet, as treated, in the various plays, they were in all essentials of those nationalities. It is not probable, for instance, that the man who enacted Sir Fopling Flutter was really a Frenchman, even during the reign of CharlesII; but it is true that the character as represented was French. He was true to type. The same is true of the other foreign types represented. The "country bumpkin" was an English

1. "The Lady's Visiting Day, " Charles Barnaby, II, i, 1701.

type, not foreign; Sir Pertinax was a Scotch type: yet Colley Cibber at one time appeared as one, at another time as the other. The characters as presented, however, were in the one case English, in the other Scotch.

I have attempted, then, to give a short historical survey of foreign types as they came down through Latin, Italian, French, and Spanish drama into English comedy of the eighteenth century; to show what characters, typically foreign, were treated in the comedy of that period; to show how these characters appeared on the stage, and went in and out among the solid, native, beef-eating English. I have presented conditions in England as suitable to such type conceptions and presentations. The eighteenth century was an age in which the London public tried to fashion most experiences of daily life according to fixed moulds, to conform with rules, and to shape with models; for all was subject to conventional standards. I have tried, furthermore, to show what England's relations with other countries were; and how those relations would tend to influence English play-wrights to the treatment of certain types in comedy. The study has involved England's attitude to other countries; it has involved the attitude of other countries to England. It involves the investigation of all such forces as might bear upon the subject - "Foreigners Represented as National Types in English Comedy of the Restoration and the Eighteenth Century."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allingham, J. T. — Heart of Oak, London, J. Ridgway, 1804.
Fortune's Frolic, In the British Drame, London, 1824.

Arbuthnot, John — Miscellaneous Works of the Late Dr. John Arbuthnot. 2nd ed. Glasgow, 1751.

Archer, William — Eminent Actors and Monthly Mirror, Jan. 1798.

Baillie, Joanna — Dramatic Works, London, 1853.

Baker, Thomas — Tunbridge Wells; or the Yeoman of Kent. London, 1703.

Bastide, Charles — The Anglo-French Entente in the Seventeenth Century, London, John Lane, 1914.

Bedford, Arthur — Evils and Dangers of Stage Plays, London, 1706.

Behn, Mrs. Aphra — The Works of Aphra Behn, London, 1874.

Beljame, Alex. — Le Public et les hommes de lettres en Angleterre au dixhuitieme siecle, Paris, 1883.

Belon, Peter — The Mock-Duellist, London, W. Crooke, 1675.

Bernbaum, Ernest — The Drama of Sensibility, 1915

Besant, Sir Walter — London in the Eighteenth Century, London, 1903.

Bickerstaffe, Isaac — Plays, London, 1767-91.

Biographia Dramatica-David Erskine, 1730-67.

Boaden, James — Plays, London, 1794-1803.

Brooke, Frances — Rosina, a Comic Opera 12th ed. London, 1788.

Bulwer-Lytton, Edward George — Works, New Library ed., Boston, 1892-93.

Burgoyne, John — Dramatic Works, London, 1807.

Burnaby, Charles — Dramatic Works, London, 1700-03.

Butler, Samuel — Poetical Works - 2 vols. London, 1806

Cambridge History of English Literature, Vols. VII, VIII, IX, X, XI.

Celtic Review — Effect of 1745 Uprising, Vol. X.

Centlivre, Mrs. Susanna — Dramatic Works, 3 Vols., London, 1761

Charlanne, Louis — L'Influence Français en Angleterre au XVII Siecle, Paris, 1906.

Cibber, Colley — Dramatic Works, 5 Vols., London, 1736.

Cicero, — De Senectute, English translation by W. Heineman, London, 1923.

Cobb, James — Dramatic Works, London, 1788-92.

Collier, J. P. — History of English Dramatic Poetry and Annals of the Stage, 3 Vols., London, 1879.

Collins, J. Churton — Voltaire, Montesquieu and Rousseau in England, London, E. Nash, 1908.

Colman, George — Dramatic Works, London, 4 Vols. 1777.

Congreve, William — Dramatic Works, London, 1887.

Cook, Dutton — Hours with the Players, London, 1876.

Cowley, Mrs. Hannah — Dramatic Works, London, 1776-95.

Cowper, William — Works by Robert Southey, London, Bohn 1853-55.

Critical Review	Vols. I to XII, 1756-1815.
Crowne, John	Dramatic Works, Edinburgh, 1873-4.
Cumberland, Richard	Dramatic Works by Stanley T. Williams, Yale University Press, 1917.
Davenant, Sir William	Works, 5 Vols., Edinburgh, 1882-84.
Defoe, Daniel	Works, London, G. Bell and Sons, 1893-1903.
Dennis, John	A Plot and No Plot, a comedy, London, 1697.
de Saussure, Cesar	Letter to his family, 1725-26.
Detouches,	L'Ambitieux et l'Indiscrete, 1737.
de Vries, T.	Holland's Influence on English Language and Literature, Chicago, C. Gretzenbach, 1916.
Dibdin, Charles	Collection of the Most Esteemed Farces and Entertainments, London, 1786.
Dilke, Thomas	The City Lady, London, H. Newman, 1697.
Disraeli, Isaac	Curiosities of Literature, 7th ed., London, 1823.
Donaldson, John	The Theatre of the Greeks, London, 1875.
Doran	Annals of the English Stage, London, J. C. Nimmo, 1888.
Drake, James	Ancient and Modern Stage Survey'd - an Answer to Jeremy Collier, London, 1699.
Dramatic Censor	Vol. II, London, J. Bell, 1770.
Dryden, John	Works, ed., Scott and Saintsbury, 13 Vols. 1882-88.

Durfey, Thomas — Marriage Hater Matched, London, Bentley, 1692, Old Mode and New, London, B. Lintott, 1709. Richmond Heiress, London, D. Brown and W. Mears, 1718.

Earle, John — Microcosmographie, ed., A. S. West, 1897.

Estcourt, Richard — The Fair Example; or, the Modish Citizen, London, B. Lintott, 1706.

Etherege, Sir George — Ed. Verity, London, 1888.

Evelyn, John — Diary, ed., Wheatley, 4 Vols. London, 1879.

Fairholt's Satirical Songs and Poems on Costume, London, Printed for Percy Society, by Richards, 1849.

Farquhar, George — Dramatic Works, ed., Wm. Archer (Mermaid Series) 1908.

Fenouillot de Falbaire, La Fabricant, Paris, 1727.

Fest, Otto — Der Miles Gloriosus in der französischen Komodie, etc., Erlangen und Leipsig, A. Deichert, 1897.

Fielding, Henry — Works, Ed., Leslie Stephen, 10 Vols., 1882.

Fitzgerald, Percy — A New History of the English Stage, London, Tinsley brothers, 1882.

Foote, Samuel — Dramatic Works, London, P. Vaillant, 1770-83.

Francke, Kuno — Social Forces in German Literature, New York, Holt and Company, 1896.

Garrick, David — Plays, London, 1759-90.

Gay, John — Works, 6 Vols., London, 1772-8.

Genest, G. Some Account of the English Stage, 10 Vols. Bath, 1832.

Gentleman's Magazine, ed. S. Urban, London, 1731-1907.

Goldsmith, Oliver A Letter to Uncle Contarine, from Leyden, 1756.

Gosse, Edmund History of Eighteenth Century Literature, 1660-1780. New York - London, 1891.

Gray's Inn Journal Feb. 1754, London, P. Vaillant

Hamilton, Anthony, Count Memoirs de Chevalier de Grammont, ed. Sir W. Scott, London, G. Bell & Sons, 1891.

Harlequin, Horace: or the Art of Modern Poetry, anonymous, London, printed for L. Gulliver, 1731.

Hazlitt, William Essays, ed. by Frank Carr, London, 1889.

Hoadley, Dr. Benjamin, The Suspicious Husband, a comedy. London, J. Bell, 1779 (Bell's British Theatre)

Hogarth, - Complete Works by Rev. J. Trusler and E. F. Roberts, London, 1806.

Holcroft, Thomas Dick's Standard Plays, London, 18 ?

Holman, Joseph Holman's Plays, London, 1796-1811

Howard, Sir Robert Five New Plays, 2d ed., London, H. Herringman, 1700.

Hume, David Letter to Madame de Bauffers, London, Jan. 19, 1766.

Inchbald, Elizabeth The British Theatre, London, Longman, Hurst, etc., 1808.

Ireland, A Sketch of the State of Ireland, Past and Present. Dublin, 1808.

Johnson, Charles — Plays, quarto, London, 1702-1719.

Johnson, Samuel — Works, Ed. Murphy, 12 Vols. London, 1824.

Jonson , Ben, — ed. H. C. Hart, London, 1906. (Methuen's Standard Library).

Jusserand, J. J. — A Literary History of the English People, New York and London, 1909

Kelly, Hugh — False Delicacy, London, R. Baldwin, 1768
School for Wives, London (In Modern Theatre) 1811.

Kurz, Harry — European Characters in French Drame of the Eighteenth Century, Columbia University Press, 1916.

Lacy, John — Dramatic Works, Edinburgh, W. Paterson, 1875

Lafa — Advertisement to a Play - Sons of Erin, a Comedy. May 5, 1812, 2d. ed., London.

Lamb, Charles — Works, London, Dent and Company, New York, Dutton and Company, 1919.

Langbaine, Gerard — An Account of English Dramatic Poets, Oxford, G. West and H. Clements, 1691.

Lanson, Gustave M. — Nivelle de La Chausée et la Comédie Larmoyante, Paris, Hachette, 1887.

Lawrence, W. J. — Irish Types in Old-Time English Drama, Anglia, V, 35, p. 347.

Lecky, W. E. A. History of England in the Eighteenth Century, 12th ed., 1899.

London Chronicle, Letter signed "Theatricus", Vol. XV.

London Magazine, or Gentleman's Monthly Intelligencer, April 1732-85, J. Wilford.

Lunn, Joseph Roses and Thorns, or, Two Houses Under One Roof, a comedy, London, J. Cumberland, 1826.

Macaulay, Thomas B. Critical and Historical Essays, etc., London, G. Routledge and Son, 1898.

Macklin, Charles Dick's Standard Plays, London, J. Dick, 18 - ?

Macready, William The Irishman in London; or, A Happy African, a farce, London, W. Woodfall, 1793.

Malcolm, James P. Anecdotes of the Manners and Customs of London During the 18th Century, London, 2d. ed., 1810.

Meredith, George An Essay on Comedy, etc., New York, Scribner's Sons, 1897.

Mezandieu, Rene Angliae Notitia

Miege, Guy On England and the English

Miller, James Letter to Lord Talbot.

Moncrief, Wm. T. Dick's Standard Plays, London, Original complete ed., J. Dick, 18 - ?

Montly Mirror: Reflecting Men and Manners, etc., London, 1795-1807.

Morton, Thomas — Dick's Standard Plays, Original complete ed., London, 18 - ?

Moryson, Fynes — "Itinerary", Glasgow, J. Mac Lehose and Sons, 1907.

Moulton, Richard G., — Ancient Classical Drama, etc., Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1898.

Murphy, Arthur — Works, London, T. Cadell, 1786.

Nettleton, George — English Drama of the Restoration and the Eighteenth Century, New York, Macmillan Company, 1914.

Nichols, John — Biographical and Literary Anecdotes of William Bowyer, printer, etc., London, 1782, 2 vols.

Nicoll, A. — History of Restoration Drama, 1660-1700, Cambridge University Press, 1923.

History of Early Eighteenth Century Drama, 1700-1750, Camb. Univ. Press, 1925.

History of Late Eighteenth Century Drama, 1750-1800, Camb. Univ. Press, 1927.

O'Keefe, John — Dick's Standard Plays, Original Complete ed., London, 18 - ?

Otway, Thomas — Works, 2 Vols., London, J. Tonson, 1728.

Overbury, Sir Thomas — Overbury His Wife, etc., 12th Ed., London, R. Swayne, 1627.

Pearson, Norman — Society Sketches in the Eighteenth Century, London, E. Arnold, 1911.

Pepys, Samuel — Diary and Correspondence, etc., London, G. Bell and Sons, 1889-90.

Pilon, Frederick — He Would be a Soldier, The Modern Theatre (Mrs. Inchbald), London, 1811, 8 Vols.

Plautus, — Translated by Henry Ridley, London, H. G. Bohn, 1852.

Pope, Alexander — Works, London, J. Murry, 1871-89.

"Ralph the Historian," The Taste of the Town," Vol. V.

Ravenscroft, Edward — A collection of the Most Esteemed Farces, etc., Edinburgh, C. Elliot, 1782.

Reed, Joseph — A Collection of the Most Esteemed Farces, etc., Edinburgh, W. Thomson, 1786.

Reynolds, Frederick — Dick's Standard Plays, London, J. Dick, 18 - ?

Riccoboni, Luigi — An Historical and Critical Account of the Theatre in Europe, etc., London, T. Waller, 1741.

Robertson, J. G. — Modern Language Review, Vol. II, 1907.

Roscoe, E. S. — English Scene in the Eighteenth Century. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1912.

Sedley, — Works of the Honourable Sir Charles Sedley, bart, etc., London, T. Davies, 1776.

Segall, J. B. — Corneille and The Spanish Drame, The Columbia University Press, 1902.

Settle, Elkanah — The City Rambler; or a Play-House Wedding, London, B. Lintott, 1711.

Shadwell, Thomas — Dramatic Works, 4 Vols., London, J. Knapton, 1720.

Sheridan, Richard B. — Dramatic Works, London, H. G. Bohn, 1854.

Smith, Winefred — The Commedia dee' Arte, etc., New York, Columbia University Press, 1912.

Smollett, Tobias — Works, G. Saintsbury, London, Gibbings and Company, 1900-03.

Southerne, Thomas — Works, London, J. Tonson, 2 Vols., 1721.

Spectator, — ed, by Morley, London, G. Routledge and Sons, 1891.

Spingarn, E. — Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1908-09.

Steele, Richard — Dramatic Works, London, J. Tonson, 1761.

Stephen, Leslie — History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century, 3rd ed., New York, Putnam's Sons, 1902.

Stevens, D. H. — Party Politics and English Journalism, 1702-1742, Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1916.

Sterne, Lawrence — Works, G. Saintsbury, London, J. M. Dent and Company, 6 Vols., 1894-1900.

Swift, Jonathan, — Works, by Sir. W. Scott, 2nd ed., London, Bickers and Son, 1883-84.

Taine, H. A. History of English Literature, Trans. by N. Van Laun, New York, J. W. Lovell, 1879.

Tatler, April, 12, 1709- to May 19, 1711, London, J. Morphew

Traverner, William The Maid the Mistress, London, E. Sanger, 1708.

Terence, Afer Publius Works, Trans. by John Sargeaunt, London, W. Heineman, 1912.

Traill, Henry D. Social England, etc., London, Cassell and Company, 1894-97.

Universal Magazine, etc. London, J. Hinton, 1747-1815.

Vanbrugh, Sir John Dramatic Works, W. C. Ward, London, Lawrence and Bullen, 1893.

Vapereau, Gustave, Eléments d'histoire de la littérature français, 2d ed., Paris, Hachette, etc., 1886.

Villiers, George The Rehearsal, ed., by Montague Summers, Stratford-upon-Avon, 1914.

Voltaire, Oeuvres de Voltaire, New York, G. E. Stechert, and Company, 1909.

Waldron, F. G. Works, London, 1778-98.

Walpole, Horace "Letters," ed., by Charles Yonge, London, T. F. Unwin, 1890.

Ward, A. W. History of English Dramatic Literature to the Death of Queene Anne, New York, Macmillan, 1899.

Waterhouse, Gilbert The Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Seventeenth Century, Cambridge University Press, 1914.

Waterhouse, Osborn — Anglia, XXX, 1907.

Westminster Journal, — October, 1745.

Wilkinson, Richard — Vice Reclaim'd, or, The Passionate Mistress, a Comedy, London, B. Lintott, 1703.

Wheatley, Henry — London, Past and Present, etc., London, J. Murray, 1891.

Wright, Thomas — Caricature History of the Georges, etc ., London, Chatto and Windus, 1876.

England Under the House of Hanover, etc., London, R. Bentley, 1848.

Wycherley, William — W. C. Ward, London, T. F. Unwin, 1896.

Wyndham, Henry S., — Annals of the Covent Garden Theatre, 1732-1897, 2 Vols., London, Chatto and Windus, 1906.

Autobiography of Henry Ernest Smith

Born 1876 (?) April 22 or 23 at Cedarville, Illinois. The family originally from near Basle, French Switzerland, about 1695 to New York and later to Illinois. Father, Lebold Smith; Mother Mina Lindeman Smith. Left orphan as a child. Attended public schools at Cedarville, at Morgan Park Academy, and graduated from the University of Chicago, A. B. 1902; Yale University M. A., 1911, and one year, 1918-1919 at Harvard. Boston University summers from 1927 to 1931, and Autumn Semester of 1929-1930.

Taught in country schools near Cedarville, Illinois, 1894-1897; High School, Whitewater, Wisconsin, 1902-1903; State Teachers College, Cheney, Washington, 1904-1906; Taber College, Iowa, 1907-1910; Massachusetts State College, 1912-1916.
In the draft during the World War, but not called.
Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, 1919-1932 part time.
Crane College, Chicago,,Illinois, 1924 -